0-2813

002202

ಜಾಗದೊಳಕೆಯಿಂದ ಬಳಸಿ

लौकिकन्यायाञ्जलिः ॥

प्रथमो भागः ॥

A HANDFUL OF POPULAR MAXIMS

CURRENT IN SANSKRIT LITERATURE.

COLLECTED BY

Colonel G. A. Jacob,

INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Author of "Concordance to the Principal Upanishads," "Manual of Hindu Pantheism" &c, &c.

THIRD EDITION—REVISED AND ENLARGED.

THE CITY BOOK DEP
AVENUE ROAD.
BANGALORE CITY

PUBLISHED

BY

PÂNDURANG JÂWAJÎ,

PROPRIETOR, OF THE "NIRṆAYA-SÂGAR" PRESS,

BOMBAY.

1925.

Price 8 Annas.

0-9813

ಪುಟ್ಟಾವಳಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ.....

[All rights reserved by the publisher.]

Publisher:—Pandurang Jawaji, } Nirnaya-sagar Press,
Printer:—Ramchandra Yesu Shedge, } 26-28, Kolbhat Lane, Bomba.

EXTRACT FROM PREFACE TO FIRST EDITION.

In Dr. Bühler's well-known Kashmir Report of 1877, we read he following:—"A curious and very useful though modern reatise is the *Laukikanyâyasangraha* of Raghunâth, a Rajut. This worthy has collected the *nyâyas* or 'inferences from miliar instances', which occur in the *S'âstras*, especially those om the *Vedântas'âstra e. g. Daṇḍâpûpikânyâya, Dehalîîpanyâya* &c. The collection is not complete, but contains a ood deal more than that Professor Bâlas'âstrî has given in his ticle in the *Paṇḍit.** P. Vâmanâchârya Jhalkîkar is at preent engaged on a still more extensive work on this subject, hich will comprise obout 900 such *nyâyas*" Page 76.

The information given in the concluding sentence raised our opes to a high pitch, for the need of such a work was great, nd Bâlas'âstrî had explained only nine of those nyâyas. But las! 'there's many a slip between the cup and lip,' and though ve have waited for this "more extensive work" for 22 long ears, there are still no signs of its appearing.

I have therefore determined to lay before the public the handful' of popular maxims which I have collected during many ears of reading, in the hope that they may become the nucleus f a very much larger collection. In Târânâth Tarkavâchasati's *Vâcaspatyam* we have a list of 151 nyâyas, popular and echnical; but references to works where they are to be found are few and far between, and this considerably lessons their value. Thirty of these were reproduced in V. S. Âpte's dictionary, in 1890, but with the same defect. Again, in 1875, Paṇḍit Satyavrata Sâmas'rami published a small pamphlet of 36 popular maxims together with a large number of purely technical ones, and professed to give a reference for each of them. But a man who refers you to the "Bhâgvata Purâṇa", to "A commentary on the Vedântabhâshya," or to "A commentary on the Kâvya-

* October and December 1867.

prakâs'a," and vouchsafes no further information whatever, i. a worthless guide! and such mere semblance of guidance deserves nothing but reprobation. One can tolerate ambiguity of this kind in the ancient writings; but in modern times, when printed books of reference abound, such vagueness is inexcusable.

My list comprises only 'popular' maxims, and therefore such purely technical ones as *Adhyâropanyâya*, *kaimutikanyâya*, *guṇopasaṁhâranyâya*, and others of a similar nature, which abound in the philosophical and grammatical works, will not be found here. Moreover, I have rigorously excluded even popular maxims which I have been unable to find *in actual use in the literature*, deeming an unverified maxim with a mere dictionary-existence as of very little value.

* * * * * *

I may add that about 22 illustrative sayings, which are practically *nyâyas*, might be gathered from the fourth Book of the *Sânkhyasûtras*; such as, for example, the well-known "अहिनिर्वयनीवत्" and others more or less useful. Some of them were published in the *Paṇḍit* for December 1876, under the title of "Stories illustrative of the Sânkhya doctrine"; but the whole will be found translated in the volume of "Sânkhya Aphorisms" published in Trübner's Oriental Series.

* * * * * *

In concluding this preface I must apologize to the reader for not givining him a bigger 'handful' of maxims, and one of better quality. But what there is has been put together in defiance of the warnings of the skilful oculist in whose hands I have been for the last five years, and therefore at some risk to failing sight. May some younger scholar be provoked to the good work of giving us something fuller and better.

Redhill, Surrey.
July 1900.

G. A. J.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

Seven years have elapsed since the publication of this book-t, and, as my researches have been continued during the hole of the interval, I have naturally collected much ad-tional material. Part of this was published as a "Second andful" in 1902, and that was succeeded by a "Third" in 1904. uring my reading I frequently came upon older references to ny of the nyâyas first published, and these have now been lized; whilst other changes, some of them of a radical nature, ve been made, and a few new nyâyas added. The discovery MSS. of Raghunâthavarman's works, as recorded in the pre-e to the "Second Handful", was of the utmost importance to e; but the student will find in my three small volumes some yâyas which even he did not explain,—amongst which are he कृत्वाचिन्तान्याय and मणिमन्त्रन्याय here incorporated for the first ime. I make no distinction now between what may be really alled a 'popular' maxim, and one of a technical nature. Both need to be explained and illustrated, so both are freely admitted. I have thoroughly revised, and considerably enlarged, the "Second Handful" also, and hope soon to see it reprinted. It will contain, amongst much new matter, the story connected with the वधूमाषमापनन्याय which so long eluded me, and for which, as well as for several other valuable items of information, I am indebted to Mr. Govind Dâs, Honorary magistrate of Benares. Another lover of Sanskrit has come to my help in the person of Mr. M. R. Telang, Head Shirastedar of the Bombay High Court, who has kindly supplied what was to me, at any rate, a novel interpretation of the लोष्टप्रस्तारन्याय. I am anxious to revise as soon as possible *the whole* of the nyâyas which I have endeavoured to elucidate, before increasing infirmities compel the abandonment of the studies which have been my delight for forty-six years.

I wish I could impart to some of my fellow countrymen resident in India, something of the enthusiasm which its grand literature awakened within me in the early part of my career, and which has never waned during this long intervening period. Such a hobby not only provides delightful mental exercise, but, better still, it draws one into *sympathetic touch* with the people amongst whom one's lot is cast.

Redhill, Surrey,
October, 1907.

G. A. JACOB.

List of Works quoted in the following pages.

Advaitabrahmasiddhi, of Sadânanda Yati; Bib. Ind., 1890.

Alankârasarvasva of Râjânaka Ruyyaka; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, Bombay, 1893.

Âpastamba-Gṛihyasûtra, with the Com. of Sudars'anârya; edited by Dr. Winternitz, Vienna, 1887.

Âtmatattvaviveka of Udayana, edited by Pandit Jîvânanda Vidyâsâgara; Calcutta, 1873.

Bhâmatî of Vâcaspatimis'ra; Bib. Ind., 1880.

Bhartṛihari's *S'atakatraya*, with Com.; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, Bombay, S'aka 1813.

Bhâshâpariccheda, with Com.; edited by L. N. Vasâka, Calcutta, 1871.

Bhedâdhikâra of Nṛisimhâs'rama Muni; Benares Sanskrit Series, 1904.

Brahmasûtrabhâṣya of S'ankarâcârya, with Ânandagiri's Com.; Ânandâs'rama Press, 2 vols, 1890-1. Translation by Dr. G. Thibaut in Sacred Books of East Series; 2 vols, 1890-6. A *fine* edition of the Bhâṣya, with the *Bhâmatî*, and two other Commentaries, was issued from the Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, in one volume, in 1904.

Brahmasûtratâtparyavivaraṇa, published in The Paṇḍit for 1882.

Bṛihadâraṇyakopaniṣadbhâṣyavârtika of Sures'varâcârya, with Ânandagiri's ṭîkâ, and full Index to verses; Ânandâs'rama Press, 2 vols, 1892-4. This is sometimes quoted as the large Vârtika.

Citsukhî of Citsukhamuni, with his own vṛitti; published in the Paṇḍit for 1882-3.

Dhvanyâloka of Ânandavardhana, with Abhinavagupta's ṭîkâ; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1891.

Gaṇaratnamahodadhi of Vardhamâna; edited by Prof. Eggeling, 1879-81. Index much needed.

Haṭhayogapradîpikâ of Svâtmârâm, with Brahmânanda's ṭîkâ; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, S'aka 1811.

History of Indian Literature, by Prof. Dr. Weber; Trübner's Oriental Series, 1878.

History of Sanskrit Literature, by Prof. A. A. Macdonell, London, 1900.

Jaimini's *Mîmâṃsâsûtra*, with S'abara's Bhaṣya; 2 vols. Bib. Ind., 1873-89.

Jîvanmuktiviveka of Vidyâraṇya; Ânandâs'rama Series, S'aka 1811.

Kâmasûtra of Vâtsyâyana; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1891.

Kathâsaritsâgara of Somadevabhaṭṭa; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1887. Translation by Prof. C. H. Tawney, 2 vols., Bib. Ind., 1880-4.

Kâvyâdars'a of Daṇḍin; Bib. Ind., 1863.

Kâvyâlankâra of Rudraṭa, with Namisâdhu's ṭîkâ; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1886.

Kâvyapradîpa of Govinda, with Vaidyanâtha's ṭîkâ; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1891.

Kâvyaprakâs'a of Mammaṭa and Allaṭa; edited by Maheś'a-candra Nyâyaratna, Calcutta, 1866.

Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhâdya of S'rîharṣa, with S'ankaramis'ra's ṭîkâ; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1888. A new edition of this work, with the Com. entitled *Vidyâsâgarî*, is now appearing in the Chaukhambâ Sanskrit Series, Benares, edited by Prof. Gangânâtha Jhâ who is also issuing a translation in the new Magazine *Indian thought*.

Khaṇḍanoddhâra, a criticism of the above, by Vâcaspati (not the celebrated philosopher, but a modern writer of about three centuries ago–so the learned Paṇḍit Govind Dâs of Benares tells me); Medical Hall Press, Benares. Incomplete.

Kusumâñjali of Udayana, with his own vṛitti, and two ṭîkâs;

2 vols, Bib. Ind., 1890-95. The Kârikâs of the same, with Haridâsa's ṭîkâ, edited and translated by Prof. Cowell; Calcutta, 1864.

Kuvalayânanda of Appaidîkṣita, with Vaidyanâtha's ṭîkâ, edited by Paṇḍit J. Vidyâsâgara; Calcutta, S'aka 1796. A very faulty edition. But an excellent one of the same two works, was published at the Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, in 1903.

Laukikanyâyasangraha of Raghunâthavarman; India office MS. 700. An *inaccurate* edition was published at the Medical Hall Press, Benares, in 1902.

Mâgha's *S'is'upâlavadha* with Mallinâtha's comment, edited by Târânâth Tarkavâcaspati; Calcutta, S'aka 1769.

Mahâbhârata, 4 vols, Calcutta 1834-39. Also an oblong edition with Nîlkaṇṭha Govind's ṭîkâ; Gaṇpat Kṛishṇâjî's Press, Bombay, S'aka 1799.

Mahâbhâṣya of Patanjali, edited by Dr. Kielhorn; 3 vols, Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1880-85. A new edition is now in course of publication; and let us hope that the learned editor will add *a complete index*.

Manusmṛiti with 7 commentaries; edited by Râo Sâhib V. N. Maṇḍlik, Bombay, 1886.

Manual of Hindu Pantheism, by Colonel Jacob; Trübner's Oriental Series, 3rd edition, 1891. This edition was *reprinted* by the publishers, about two years ago, without the author's knowledge, and therefore without the revision necessary to bring it up to date.

Molesworth's *Marāṭhi-English Dictionary*; 2nd. edition, Bombay, 1857.

Mṛicchakaṭikanâṭaka, edited by N. B. Goḍbole; Bombay, 1896. Translation by Dr. Ryder; Harvard Oriental Series, 1905.

Mudrârâkṣasanâṭaka with Ḍhuṇḍhirâja's ṭîkâ, edited by K. T. Telang; Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1884.

Naiṣkarmyasiddhi of Sures'vara, with the comment of Jnânottama; edited by Colonel Jacob, 2nd. edition, Bombay, 1906.

Nîtisâra of Kâmandaki, with ṭîkâ; Bib. Ind., 1884.

Nyâyabinduṭîkâ of Dharmottara, edited by Prof. P. Peterson; Bib. Ind., 1889.

Nyâyakandalî of S'rîdhara, with the text of Pras'astapâda's *Vais'eṣikabhâṣya*; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1895. It is a lamentable thing that this fine series has come to a premature end. A translation of both works is now appearing in the Paṇḍit.

Nyâyakaṇikâ, a Commentary by Vâcaspatimis'ra on Maṇḍanamis'ra's *Vidhiviveka*, with which it is now being published in the Paṇḍit.

Nyâyamakaranda of Ânandabodha, with comment by Citsukha Muni; Chaukhambâ Sanskrit Series, Benares. Incomplete.

Nyâyamanjarî of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1895.

Nyâyasiddhântadîpa of S'eṣadharâcârya, with comment of S'eṣânanta; in course of publication in Paṇḍit.

Nyâyavârtika of Uddyotakâra; Bib. Ind., 1907. The first fasciculus was issued in 1887; the title page, this year!

Nyâyavârtikatâtparyaṭîkâ of Vâcaspatimis'ra; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1895. Often quoted as *Tâtparyaṭîkâ*. When are we going to have an edition of Udayana's *Paris'uddhi*?

Padamanjarî, a Commentary on *Kâs'ikâvṛitti*; published in the Paṇḍit, 2 vols.

Pancadas'î of Vidyâraṇya, with Râmakṛishṇa's comment; edited by Paṇḍit J. Vidyâsâgara, Calcutta, 1882.

Pancapâdikâ of Padmapâda; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1891. Said to be the oldest comment on S'ankara's bhâṣya (sûtras 1-4 only).

A translation of the first 14 pages of this work, by Mr. Arthur Venis, was published in the Paṇḍit, but then, alas! it ceased!

Pancatantra, edited by Professors Bühler and Kielhorn; Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1385.

Pariś'iṣṭaparvan of Hemacandra, edited by Prof. H. Jacobi; Bib. Ind., 1891.

Practical Sanskrit Dictionary by V. S. Âpṭe; Poona, 1890.

Prasannarâghava Nâṭaka of Jayadeva; Nirṇaya-Sâgar Press, 1893.

Râjataraṅgiṇî of Kalhaṇa, edited by Paṇḍit Durgâprasâda; Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1892-96.

Râmâyaṇa of Vâlmîki; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 2 vols, 1888.

Rasagangâdhara of Jagannâth Paṇḍit, with Nages'a Bhaṭṭa's ṭîkâ; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1888.

Rational Refutation of Hindu Philosophical Systems, by N. S'âstrî Gore, translated from the Hindî by Dr. Fitzedward Hall; Calcutta, 1862.

Ṣaḍdars'anacintanikâ of Mahadeo Moreshwar Kunte, in Sanskrit, Marâṭhi and English; Poona, 1877-82. Incomplete.

Ṣaḍdars'anasamuccaya of Haribhadrasûri, with the comment of Maṇibhadra; Chaukhambâ Sanskrit Series, Benares, 1905. About half of the chapter on Jainism is found, word for word, in the *Syâdvâdamanjarî!* Which was the plagiarist, this man or Malliṣeṇa?

S'ankaravijaya of Ânandagiri; Bib. Ind., 1868.

Sânkhyasûtravṛitti of Aniruddha, with Extracts from Vedantin Mahâdeva's Commentary, edited and translated by Dr. R. Garbe; Bib. Ind., 1888 and 1892.

Sânkhyatattvakaumudi of Vâcaspatimis'ra, edited by Paṇḍit Târânâth Tarkavâcaspati; Calcutta, 1871.

Sankṣhepas'ârîraka of Sarvajnâtma Muni; *The Paṇḍit*, vols., IV–X. New Series.

Saptapadârthî of S'ivâditya, with comment by Mâdhava Sarasvati; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1893.

Sarvadars'anasangraha of Mâdhava; Bib. Ind., 1858. An edition by Jivânanda Vidyâsâgara, Calcutta, 1871. Translation by Professors Cowell and Gough, in Trübner's Oriental Series, 1882. This, too, was reprinted by the publishers, without the much-needed revision. An edition of the Text, with an additional chapter on S'ankara's system, and the text of Madhusûdana Sarasvati's *Prasthânabheda*, was published at the Ânandâs'rama Press in 1906.

S'âstradîpikâ of Parthasârathi Mis'ra; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1891.

Satyavrata Sâmas'rami's *Nyâyâvali*; Calcutta, 1875.

Siddhântales'a of Appaidîkṣita; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1890. A translation by Mr. Arthur Venis is being published in *the Paṇḍit*. So far, it extends to page 47 only of the text. I hope my learned friend will carry this on to completion; for his renderings and critical notes are always of the highest value.

Syâdvâdamanjarî, a Commentary by Malliṣeṇa on Hemacandra's verses entitled *Vîtarâgastuti*; Chaukhambâ Sanskrit Series, Benares, 1900. This work is wrongly described by Râjendralâl Mitra, in his *Notices of Sanskrit Mss.* vol. iv, page 87, as "A Commentary *in verse*," and ascribed to Gaganadinamani. See the remarks, above, on *Saḍdars'anasamuccaya*.

Taittirîyopaniṣadbhâshyavârtika of Sures'varâcârya, with Ânandajnâna's ṭîkâ; Ânandâs'rama Press, S'aka 1811.

Tantravârtika of Kumârila; Benares Sanskrit Series, 1903. Prof. Gangânâtha Jhâ is bringing out a translation of this important work in the Bibliotheca Indica Series. He has already, through the same channel, published a complete translation of the first volume of Kumârila's work, the S'lokavârtika.

Târkikarakṣâ of Varadarâja, with the Commentary (in part) of Mallinâtha; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1903.

Tattavamuktâkalâpa of Venkaṭnâtha, with his own comment; Medical Hall press, Benares, 1900. In the Sarvadars'anasangraha it is quoted as *Tattvamuktâvali*.

Udânam, a Buddhist work, published by Pâli Text Society, 1885.

Upamitibhavaprapancâ Kathâ of Siddharṣi, edited by Professors Peterson and Jacobi; Bib. Ind., 1899-1907. Incomplete.

Upades'asâhasrî of S'ankarâcârya, with Râmatîrtha's ṭîkâ; edited by Kṛishṇa S'âstrî Navare, Bombay, 1886.

Vâcaspatyam, a Sanskrit Lexicon, of 5442 pages, by Paṇḍit Târânâtha Tarkavâcaspati, Calcutta. It is very full up to the end of ক্ব (page 4550), whilst the rest of the alphabet is squeezed into 900 pages! It is said that the Bengal Govt., which largely subsidized the undertaking, ordered it to be curtailed. If that is so, it did a very unwise thing! We ought to store up the knowledge of these old Paṇḍits who are fast dying out!

Vedântakalpataru of Amalânanda, a commentary on the Bhâmatî; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1895-7.

Vedântakalpataruparimala of Appaidîksita; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1895-8. Sometimes quoted as *Parimala*.

Vedântasâra of Sadânanda, with the commentaries of Nṛisiṃhasarasvati and Râmatîrtha; edited by Colonel Jacob, and published at Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1894. For the translation of the same, see *Manual of Hindu Pantheism*.

Vedântasiddhântamuktâvali of Prakâs'ânanda, edited and translated by Prof. Arthur Venis; Benares, 1890.

Vidvanmaḍṇana of Viṭṭhala Upâddhyâya, edited by Ratnagopâla; Victoria Press, Benares, 1904. In Hall's *Index* this is described as "Strictures on the expositions of several expositors of the Vedânta doctrine." It ascribes to the same author a work entitled *Bhaktihetunirṇaya*.

Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha of Vidyâraṇya; Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, 1893. A translation by Dr. Thibaut is now appearing in the new Review, *Indian Thought*.

Yas'astilaka of Somadeva, with S'rîs'rutasâgara's ṭîkâ; Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 2 vols. 1901-3.

Yogasûtra with Vyâsa's bhâṣhya and Vâcaspatimis'ra's ṭîkâ, edited by Râjârâm S'âstrî Boḍas; Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1892.

Yogavârtika of Vijnâna Bhikṣu; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1884.

Yogavâsiṣṭha with the Commentary of Ânandabodhendra Saraswati; Gaṇpat Kṛishṇâjî's Press, Bombay. This ought to be printed in modern style. The huge oblong tomes are most difficult to handle.

CATALOGUE OF SANSKRIT WORKS

BHÂṆAS.

	Price Rs.	as.	*Postage.*	
Rasasadanbhân	0	8	0	2
S'ṛingârabhûshaṇa by Vâmana-Bhaṭṭa-Bâṇa ...	0	3	0	2
S'ṛingâratilaka by Râmabhadra Dîkshita ...	0	6	0	2

ALANKÂRA—(RHETORICS).

Abhidhâvṛittimâtṛikâ and **S'abdavyâpâravichâra.** Both these ancient works treat in a very comprehensive manner the principles of the science of Rhetoric... 0 6 0 2

Chitra-mîmâṁsâ by Appaya Dîkshita and the **Chitra-mîmâṁsâ-khaṇḍana** by Jagannâtha Paṇḍit; with notes from the commentary (Gurumarmaprakâs'a) by Nâges'abhaṭṭa on the Rasa-gangâdhara. ... 0 15 0 4

Das'a-rûpaka by Dhanañjaya, with the commentary (Avaloka) by Dhanika... ... 0 12 0 2

Karṇa-bhushaṇa by Gangânanda Kavirâja ... 0 8 0 2

Kâvyapradîpa by Govinda, with the commentary (Prabhâ) by Vaidyanâtha Tatsat. ... 2 0 0 6

Kâvyâlankâra by Rudraṭa, with the commentary by Nami-sâdhu 1 8 0 1½

Kâvyânus'âsana by Vâgbhaṭa, with his own gloss (Alankâra-tilaka) 0 7 0 2

Kâvyânus'âsana by Hemachandra with his own gloss (Alankâra-chûdâmaṇi) 2 4 0 8

	Price Rs.	as.	*Postage.*
Kâvyâlankâra-Sangraha—by Udbhatâchârya with the commentary by Pratîhârendurâja. The author lived in the 8th century A. D. and the commentator, a native of the Konkan, lived in the 9th century. The original and the commentary form quite a compendious but explanatory work on Alankâra	0	10	0 4
Kuvalayânanda-kârikâ by Âs'âdhara, with his own gloss (Alankâra-dîpikâ)... ...	0	8	0 2
Rasa-gaṅgâdhara by Jagannâtha Paṇḍit, with the commentary (Guru-marmaprakâs'a) by Nâges'abhaṭṭa.	3	8	0 8
Sâhitya-kaumudî by Vidyâbhûshaṇa, with the Kṛishṇânandinî commentary	1	8	0 4
Sâhîtya-Sâra by Achyutarâya with his own gloss. An excellent work on the science of Rhetoric	2	8	0 8
Sâhitya-darpaṇa by Vis'vanâtha Kavirâja, with the commentary(Vivṛti) by Râmchandra Tarkavâgîs'a. One of the best and standard works on Rhetoric	4	0	0 8
Vâgbhaṭâlankâra by Vâgbhaṭa, with the commentary by Siṁhadeva-gaṇi	0	8	0 2
Vṛitti-vârtika by Appaya Dîkshita	0	3	0 1

PANDURANG JAWAJI,

Proprietor, Nirnaya-sagar Press,

Kalbadevi Road, BOMBAY.

A HANDFUL OF POPULAR MAXIMS.

अजाकृपाणीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the she-goat and the sword.* It is founded on some story of a goat's being suddenly killed by accidental contact with a sword, and is used to illustrate any surprising event happening altogether by chance. It, therefore, belongs to the same class as **काकतालीय, खल्वाटबिल्वीय** and others of a similar kind. An excellent illustration of its use is found on page 229 of S'rîharsha's *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhâdya*:—"**पाणौ पञ्च वराटकान्पिधाय कश्चित्पृच्छति कति वराटका इति। पृष्टश्चाजाकृपाणीयन्यायेन ब्रवीति पञ्चेति**" ॥ In a footnote the maxim is thus explained:—"**कण्डूयनार्थं स्तंभादौ शिथिलबन्धखड्गे छागी ग्रीवां प्रसारयति यदृच्छया च ग्रीवा छिद्यते तथाभूतोऽजाकृपाणीयन्यायः काकतालीयन्यायसमः**" ॥ Vardhamâna puts it differently in his comment on *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 196:—"**यथाजया भूमिं खनन्त्यात्मवधाय कृपाणो दर्शितस्तत्तुल्यं वृत्तं केनचिदात्मविनाशाय कृतमजाकृपाणीयम्**" ॥ For another variety, see *Padamañjarî* on *Kâs'ikâ* 5. 3. 106.

The nyâya, with the same illustration, is found also in the *Khaṇḍanoddhâra*, page 52; and the illustration, *without* the nyâya, in *Siddhântales'a*, page 95. Then on page 96, it is again referred to in the expression "**काकतालीयसंवादिवराटकसंख्याविशेषाहार्यज्ञानवत्.**"

It is interesting to note that the Marâṭhî-speaking folk of Western India have adopted the maxim, but with a changed meaning. Molesworth defines it as "The maxim of the sword upon the neck of the goat. Expressive of meekness and absolute helplessness."

अन्तर्दीपिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a lamp in a central position.* Applied to something which fulfils a double purpose. It occurs in S'ankara's bhâshya on the *Muṇḍaka Upanishad* 3. 1. 5. ("सत्येन लभ्यस्तपसा ह्येष आत्मा सम्यग्ज्ञानेन ब्रह्मचर्येण नित्यम्" ।) on which he says:—"नित्यं सर्वदा । नित्यं सत्येन नित्यं तपसा नित्यं सम्यग्ज्ञानेनेति सर्वत्र नित्यशब्दोऽन्तर्दीपिकान्यायेनानुषक्तव्यः" ॥ It is akin to देहलीदीपन्याय and मध्यदीपन्याय. Jîvânanda's edition of the *Muṇḍakabhâshya* reads अन्त्यदीपकन्यायेन. The reading given above is from the Ânandâs'rama edition.

अन्धकवर्तकीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the blind man and the quail.* Like अजाकृपाणीय and many others, it is used to express a wholly fortuitous occurrence. Vardhamâna, on *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 195, explains it thus:—"अन्धकश्च वर्तका च अन्धकवर्तकम् । अन्धकस्य वर्तकाया उपर्यतर्कितः पादन्यास उच्यते । तत्तुल्यमन्धकवर्तकीयम्" ॥ This authority brings the quail under the blind man's *foot;* but the commentator S'rīs'rutasâgara, who expounded the work *Yas'astilaka,** and who in the colophon is described as "तर्कव्याकरणछन्दोलंकारसिद्धान्तसाहित्यादिशास्त्रनिपुणमतिः प्राकृतव्याकरणाद्यनेकशास्त्ररचनाचुञ्चुः," brings the bird into the man's *hands.* And, surely, such a prodigy of learning *must* be right! The verse in which the expression अन्धकवर्तकीय occurs is *Yas'astilaka* ii. 153. "संसारसागरमिमं भ्रमता नितान्तं जीवेन मानवभवः समवापि दैवात्। तत्रापि यद्भुवनमान्यकुले प्रसूतिः सत्सङ्गतिश्च तदिहान्धकवर्तकीयम्" ॥ "It is altogether by chance that a soul wandering about in this ocean of repeated births is born as a man; and that he should be born into a family of repute in the world, and enjoy the society of the good, is likewise as accidental as in the case of the blind man and the

* This important work, described by Dr. Peterson at considerable length in his Second Report, was published in the *Kâvyamâlâ,* a valuable periodical issued by the Proprietor of the Nirṇaya-sâgar Press.

quail." S'rîs'rutasâgara's explanation of the last term is as follows:—"अन्धकवर्तकीयो दृष्टान्तः। यथा कश्चिदन्धकः पुमान् करतलेन करं ताडयन्वर्तते तस्य करद्वयमध्ये वर्तकः पक्षिविशेषः समायाति स तु दुर्लभस्तथा मानवभवे सत्सङ्गतिर्दुर्लभा वर्तते" ॥

अन्धगजन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the blind men and the elephant.* A number of blind men desired to form an idea of the shape of an elephant. One touched his trunk and thought he must be like a snake; another took hold of a leg and supposed that he was like a post, and so on. Târânâtha tells us that it is used to illustrate the divergence of views held by the ignorant in regard to Îs'vara.

The story is found in the Buddhist work *Udânam* (vi. 4, pages 66-69) published by the Pâli Text Society in 1885.

It is referred to in Sures'vara's large *Vârtika* 4. 4. 566 (page 1813) as follows:—"एकमेवैकरूपं सद्वस्त्वज्ञातं निरञ्जनम्। जात्यन्धगजदृष्टयेव कोटिशः कल्प्यते मृषा" ॥ Also in his *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* ii. 93:—"तदेतदद्वयं ब्रह्म निर्विकारं कुबुद्धिभिः। जात्यन्धगजदृष्टयेव कोटिशः परिकल्प्यते" ॥ I have met with the nyâya again on pages 107 and 160 of *Syâdvâdamanjarî.* It occurs also in the Jainadars'ana of *Saḍdars'anasamuccaya* (page 46); but the passage in which it is found was taken *verbatim* from Malliṣeṇa's work, without any acknowledgment.

अन्धगोलाङ्गूलन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the blind man and the cow's tail.* The story is that an evil-disposed fellow found a blind man who, having lost his way, was wandering about helplessly. Expressing great sympathy for him, and promising to help him, the man led him to a young and frisky cow, and putting her tail into his hand told

him to hold on, and that she would certainly lead him to the village to which he wished to go. The result was, of course, most disastrous.

S'ankara, in his bhâshya on *Vedântasûtra* 1. 1. 7, applies the maxim to the case of a teacher who wrongly instructs his pupil in regard to emancipation and so leads him to destruction! These are his words:—"यदि चाज्ञस्य सतो मुमुक्षोरचेतनमात्मानमात्मेत्युपदिशेत्प्रमाणभूतं शास्त्रं स श्रद्दधानतयान्धगोलाङ्गूलन्यायेन तदात्मदृष्टिं न परित्यजेत्तद्व्यतिरिक्तं चात्मानं न प्रतिपद्येत तथा सति पुरुषार्थाद्विहन्येतानर्थं च ऋच्छेत्" ॥ The nyāya is found, too, in *Pancapâdikâvivaraṇa*, page 170.

अन्धपरम्परान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a continuous series of blind men.* It would seem to be in this sense that S'ankarâchârya uses it in his *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 2. 2. 30, 37. The passages stand thus:—"अनादित्वेऽप्यन्धपरम्परान्यायेनाप्रतिष्ठैवानवस्था व्यवहारलोपिनी स्यान्नाभिप्रायसिद्धिः"।"वर्तमानकालवदतीतेष्वपि कालेष्वितरेतराश्रयदोषाविशेषादन्धपरम्परान्यायापत्तेः" ॥ In his rendering of the former passage, Dr. Thibaut has overlooked the maxim, but the latter he translates as follows:—"For in past time as well as in the present, mutual interdependence of the two took place, so that the beginningless series is like *an endless chain of blind men leading other blind men.*" I should add that, in the former case, S'ankara is arguing against the Buddhist theory of a beginningless series of mental impressions, and, in the latter, against the Sânkhya notion of a similar chain of human actions and divine interpositions. Dr. Thibaut's explanation of the maxim is quite in accord with that of Dr. Garbe in his rendering of the *Sânkhyasūtra* iii. 81 "इतरथान्धपरम्परा" "Else there would be a tradition [comparable to a row] of blind men [leading each other]."

A very apt quotation from one of Coleridge's *Lay Sermons* is given in that useful work *A Rational Refutation of Hindu Philosophical Systems* (now quite out of print), from which I

extract the following:—"The old man talked much and vehemently concerning an infinite series of causes and effects, which he explained to be a string of blind men, the last of whom caught hold of the skirt of the one before him, he of the next, and so on till they were all out of sight; and that they all walked infallibly straight, without making one false step, though all were alike blind. Methought I borrowed courage from surprise, and asked him, 'Who, then, is at the head to guide them?' He looked at me with ineffable contempt, not unmixed with an angry suspicion and then replied, "No one; the string of blind men goes on for ever without any beginning, for although one blind man cannot move without stumbling, yet infinite blindness supplies the want of sight."

In the opening part of the *Padamañjarî* (*Paṇḍit* x. 248) we find the expression अन्धपरम्पराप्रसङ्ग used with reference to testimony received through a series of blind men, and therefore of doubtful value. It is part of an interesting discussion regarding different forms of a word, why some are considered correct and others not. "तत्र ये साधवस्ते शास्त्रेणानुशिष्यन्तेऽसाधुभ्यो विविक्ताः प्रकृतिप्रत्ययविभागेन ज्ञाप्यन्त इमे साधव इति। कथं पुनरिदमाचार्येण पाणिनिनावगतमेते साधव इति। आपिशलेन पूर्वव्याकरणेन। आपिशलिना तर्हि केनावगतम्। ततः पूर्वेण व्याकरणेन। यद्येवमन्धपरम्पराप्रसङ्गः। तद्यथा शुक्लं क्षीरमित्यन्धेनोक्ते केनेदमवगतमिति पृष्टो यदान्धान्तरं मूलं निर्दिशति सोऽप्यन्धान्तरं तदा नैतद्वचः शौक्ल्ये प्रमाणं भवति तादृगेतत्" ॥

That the nyâya is in very general use will be apparent from the following additional references. *Tantravârtika*, pages 11, 72, 75, 232, 799, 877. *Pancapâdikâ*, pages 98. *Bhâmatî*, pages 254, 464. *Nyâyamanjarî* pages 234, 249, 251, 425, 492.

अरुन्धतीप्रदर्शनन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the pointing out of the star Arundhatî*. The idea here is that of gradual instruction, on the principle of the अध्यारोपापवादन्याय for which see the Second Handful. Its

usage is explained by S'ankara in *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 1. 1. 8, as follows:—"यथारुन्धतीं दिदर्शयिषुस्तत्समीपस्थां स्थूलां तारामुख्यां प्रथममरुन्धतीति ग्राहयित्वा तां प्रत्याख्याय पश्चादरुन्धतीमेव ग्राहयति तद्वन्नायमात्मेति ब्रूयात्" ॥ Similarly, too, in 1. 1. 12, we read:—"यथारुन्धतीनिदर्शने बह्वीष्वपि तारास्वमुख्यास्वरुन्धतीषु दर्शितासु यान्त्या प्रदर्श्यते सा मुख्यैवारुन्धती भवत्येवमिहाप्यानन्दमयस्य सर्वान्तरत्वान्मुख्यमात्मत्वम्" ॥ The maxim is sometimes styled स्थूलारुन्धतीन्याय, and it appears under this name in Nṛisiṁhasarasvatî's commentary on section 20 of the *Vedântsâra*—that section which gives the views of Châr vâkas and others as to the *âtman*.

अर्के चेन्मधु विन्देत किमर्थं पर्वतं व्रजेत् ॥

If one can find honey on the Arka-tree [close at hand] *then why go to the mountain for it?* That is, if an object can be accomplished by simple means, don't adopt a more complicated method. This is well illustrated by S'ankara in his *Vedântasûtrabhâshya* 3. 4. 3, as follows:—"केवलाच्चेज्ज्ञानात्पुरुषार्थसिद्धिः स्यात्किमर्थमनेकायाससमन्वितानि कर्माणि ते कुर्युः। अर्के चेन्मधु विन्देत किमर्थं पर्वतं व्रजेदिति न्यायात्" ॥

Its source, however, is S'abara on *Jaimini* 1. 2. 4. Here, the *Pûrvapakshin*, after taking exception to certain Vedic injunctions as useless says:—"तद्यथा पथि जातेऽर्के मधूत्सृज्य तेनैव पथा मध्वर्थिनः पर्वतं न गच्छेयुस्तादृशं हि तत्। अपि चाहुः। अर्के चेन्मधु विन्देत किमर्थं पर्वतं व्रजेत्। इष्टस्यार्थस्य संसिद्धौ को विद्वान्यत्नमाचरेत्" ॥ The same couplet is quoted by Aniruddha in his comment on *Sâṅkhyasûtra* i. 1; also by Vâchaspati Mis'ra in his *Sânkhyatattvakaumudî* 1., and again in his *Nyâyavârtikatâtparyaṭîkâ*, page 220. Instead of अर्के, however, we have in the former instance अक्के and in the latter अक्के. Raghunâth reads अक्के and explains it by गृहकोणे. One more example of the application of this nyâya may be found in Kumârila's *Tantravârtika* 1. 2. 17:—

"यद्यल्पान्महतश्च कर्मणः समं फलं जायेत ततोऽङ्के चेन्मधु विन्देतेत्यनेनैव न्यायेनाल्पेन सिद्धे महति न कश्चित्प्रवर्तेत" ॥

अर्धजरतीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the semi-senile woman.* It is very difficult to fix on the exact force of this saying. Authorities differ so much as to make it almost an instance of *quot homines tot sententiæ.* As expounded by Vardhamâna (iii. 195) it seems to imply *indefiniteness, half-and-half-ness, the being neither one thing nor the other.* He says:—"यथा स्त्री न तरुणी श्लथस्तनत्वात् कृष्णकेशत्वान्न जरती वक्तुं शक्यते तद्वत्सिद्धासिद्धं प्रयोजनम्" ॥ This seems to accord with the meaning assigned to it by Marâṭhas, as shown by Molesworth in his Marâthî dictionary where he defines it as "Action of indeterminate character; speech vague and indefinite; a proceeding void of decided learning or bearing."

The maxim is cited by S'ankara in *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 1. 1. 19, and again in 1. 2. 8. In the former, after quoting *Taittirîya-upanishad* ii. 1-4 in regard to अन्नरसमय, प्राणमय &c. he says:—"इति विकारार्थे मयट्प्रवाहे सत्यानन्दमय एवाकस्मादर्धजरतीयन्यायेन कथमिव मयटः प्राचुर्यार्थत्वं ब्रह्मविषयत्वं वाश्रीयत इति" ॥ The commentators Ânandagiri and Râmânanda (erroneously styled Govindânanda*) ignore the maxim entirely, and so does Dr. Thibaut in his translation. In the second instance, S'ankara says:—"यथाशास्त्रं तर्हि शास्त्रीयोऽर्थः प्रतिपत्तव्यो न तत्रार्धजरतीयं लभ्यम्," which is rendered by Dr. Thibaut, "Very well, then, it appears that the truth about scriptural matters is to be ascertained from scripture, and that *scripture is not sometimes to be appealed to and on other occasions to be disregarded.*" Ânandagiri's comment is:—"न हि कुक्कुटादेरेकदेशो भोगाय पच्यत एकदेशस्तु प्रसवाय कल्प्यते विरोधात्", "You cannot take one part of a fowl for cooking and leave the other part to lay eggs;" that is, you must take a

---

* See Dr. Fitzedward Hall's *Index*, page 90.

thing in its entirety, or else leave it altogether. Râmânanda on the other hand, says:—"अर्धं मुखमात्रं जरत्या वृद्धायाः कामयते नाङ्गानीति सोऽयमर्धजरतीयन्यायः स चात्र न युक्तः," which seems to be based on Patanjali's words "न चेदानीमर्धजरतीयं लभ्यं... । तद्यथा । अर्धं जरत्याः कामयतेऽर्धं नेति", as found in *Mahâbhâshya* 4. 1. 78.* Again we find the maxim in the Bauddha section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 14 of Bib. Ind., and 17 of Jîvânanda's edn.), which reads thus:—"न चार्धजरतीयमुचितम् । न हि कुक्कुट्या एको भागः पाकायापरो भागः प्रसवाय कल्प्यतामिति कल्प्यते", and which is identical with Ânandagiri's exposition. Prof. Gough, who translated this chapter, rendered the maxim by "semi-effete"—"Nor is a semi-effete existence admissible."

Another excellent illustration of the usage of this nyâya is given in the following passage of the *Brahmasûtratâtparyavivaraṇa* 3. 4. 26. (The Paṇḍit vol. vi. page 220):—"ब्रह्मविद्या स्वफले कर्माणि नापेक्षते तथा स्वोत्पत्तावपि नापेक्षते । अन्यथा क्वचिदपेक्षा क्वचिन्नेत्यर्धजरतीयत्वापत्तिरिति प्राप्ते आह सर्वापेक्षेति । नार्धजरतीयन्यायो योग्यतावशादेवैकस्यैव कार्यविशेषेष्वपेक्षानपेक्षयोरुपपत्तेः । यथा लाङ्गलवहनेऽनपेक्षितोऽश्वो रथवहनेऽपेक्ष्यते तद्वत्स्वोत्पत्तौ तु विद्या कर्मापेक्षते" ॥

Other references are the following:—*Saptapadârthî*, page 26. *Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha*, page 21. *Nyâyamanjarî*, pages 248, 249. *Advaitabrahmasiddhi*, page 340.

अशक्तोऽहं गृहारम्भे शक्तोऽहं गृहभञ्जने ॥

I am too weak to construct a house, but I am well able to destroy one. This is found in Ḍhuṇḍhirâja's commentary on *Mudrârâkshasa* iii. 11. Chãṇakya says—"कथं स्पर्द्धते मया सह दुरात्मा राक्षसः"। and then follows the verse "कृतागाः कौटिल्यो भुजग

---

* Vol. ii. page 231 of the edition by Dr. F. Kielhorn, who himself most kindly gave me the reference.

इव निर्याय नगरात् &c.," on which Ḍhuṇḍhirâja remarks:—"ममेव नास्य बुद्धिबलं परंतु मत्सरमात्रेण अशक्तोऽहं गृहारम्भे शक्तोऽहं गृहभञ्जन इति न्यायेन मौर्यापकारमात्राय प्रयतमानः सन्केवलं पौरुषबलमवष्टभ्य मद्बुद्धेः प्रकर्षमतिशयितुं व्यवसित इत्यहो राक्षसस्य दुर्व्यवसितामिति" ॥ I am indebted for this passage to the late learned Librarian at the India Office, C. H. Tawney Esqr., who has also pointed out to me *Pancatantra* i. 363 as illustrating the nyâya.

The verse reads thus:—

"घातयितुमेव नीचः परकार्यं वेत्ति न प्रसाधयितुम् ।
पातयितुमेव शक्तिर्नाखोरुद्धर्तुमन्नपिटम्" ॥

अशोकवनिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the grove of As'oka trees.* Âpṭe says "Râvaṇa kept Sîtâ in the grove of As'oka trees, but it is not easy to account for his preference of that particular grove to any other one; so when a man finds several ways of doing a thing, any one of them may be considered as good as another, and the preference of any particular one cannot be accounted for." For the As'oka-grove see *Râmâyaṇa* 1. 1. 73. The only example of this nyâya that I have met with is in S'eṣânanta's ṭîkâ on S'as'adhara's *Nyâyasiddhântadîpa*, page 11. This work was commenced in the Paṇḍit for April 1903, but is still incomplete.

अश्मलोष्टन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the stone and clod of earth.* Âpṭe, following the *Vâcaspatyam*, explains it thus:—"A clod may be considered to be hard when compared with cotton, but is soft as compared with a stone. So a person may be considered to be very important as compared with his inferiors, but sinks into insignificance when compared with his betters." Târânâtha adds that when it is intended to indicate that there is *very little* differance between two things or persons compared, the kindred

maxim पाषाणेष्टकान्याय is used. With these Âpṭe compares the Marâṭhî proverb "दगडापेक्षां वीट मऊ" "Brick is soft than stone." The sense, however, is not quite the same; for, according to Molesworth, the Marâṭhî saying is used "in ironical softening of a difficulty or hardship but *barely* surmountable or sufferable, by comparing it with a matter *utterly* impracticable or intolerable."

Is it not much more likely however that the maxim is based on *Bṛihadâraṇyaka Upanishad* 1. 3. 7, "यथाश्मानमृत्वा लोष्टो विध्वंसेत" which S'ankara expounds thus:—"यथा लोकेऽश्मानं पाषाणमृत्वा गत्वा प्राप्य लोष्टः पांसुपिण्डः पाषाणचूर्णनायाश्मनि निक्षिप्तः स्वयं विध्वंसेत विस्रंसेत विचूर्णीभवेत्" ? This is referred to in *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 3. 3. 6. as the "अश्मलोष्टनिदर्शन" and it seems to remind one of the Scripture saying "Whosover shall fall upon that stone shall be broken; but on whomsover it shall fall, it will grind him to powder."

अस्त्रमस्त्रेण शाम्यति ॥

A weapon is silenced by a weapon. Perhaps analogous to the saying "Diamond cuts diamond," or, "Set a thief to catch a thief." It occurs in Jnânottama's commentary on Sures'vara's *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* i. 81, where he says:—"नन्वस्त्रमस्त्रेण शाम्यतीति न्यायेन काम्यैः काम्यानां निषिद्धैर्निषिद्धानां निवृत्तिरस्त्विवत्यत आह न च काम्यैरिति" ॥

Compare with this *Nîtisâra* viii. 67:—

"विषं विषेण व्यथते वज्रं वज्रेण भिद्यते ।
गजेन्द्रो दृष्टसारेण गजेन्द्रेणैव बध्यते" ॥

अस्नेहदीपन्यायः ॥

The simile of *a Lamp without oil* [that is, from which the oil has burnt out]. Raghunâthavarama explains it thus:—"अस्मिंश्चाध्यासेऽज्ञानं कारणम् । तत्त्वज्ञानेन वातदीपन्यायेन तन्निवृत्तावस्नेहदीपन्यायेन तदध्यासोऽपि निवर्तते । न च ज्ञानेनैवोभयनिवृत्तिः कुतो न

स्यात्। ज्ञानमज्ञानस्यैव निवर्तकमिति न्यायविरोधात्। द्विविधा हि निवृत्तिर्विरोधिना सामग्रीनिवृत्त्या च। यथा वातादिना दीपनाशो यथा च तैलवर्त्यादिनिवृत्त्या दीपनिवृत्तिः। तत्राद्या निवृत्तिरज्ञानस्य द्वितीया कार्यवर्गस्येति बोध्यम्" ॥

I have met with the following example of the nyâya in *Yogavâsiṣṭha* 2. 1. 44, a chapter entitled शुकनिर्याणम्:—

"तत्र वर्षसहस्राणि निर्विकल्पसमाधिना।
दश स्थित्वा शशामासावात्मन्यस्नेहदीपवत्" ॥

For the nyâya ज्ञानमज्ञानस्यैव निवर्तकम् see the *Third Handful of Popular Maxims*; and for निर्विकल्पसमाधि see *Vedântasâra*, pp. 55, 57, &c., and *Manual of Hindu Pantheism*, pages 109, 110.

अहिकुण्डलन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the snake and its coils*. The expression occurs in *Brahmasûtra* 3. 2. 27, and is explained in the *bhâshya*. They read thus:—"उभयव्यपदेशात्त्वहिकुण्डलवत् ॥ ...अत उभयव्यपदेशदर्शनादहिकुण्डलवदत्र तत्त्वं भवितुमर्हति। यथाहिरित्यभेदः कुण्डलाभोगप्रांशुत्वादीनीति च भेद एवमिहापीति" ॥ Dr. Thibaut's translation is as follows:—"But on account of twofold designation, (the relation of the highest Self to the individual soul has to be viewed) like that of the snake to its coils.....We therefore look on the relation of the highest Self and the soul as analogous to that of the snake and its coils. Viewed as a whole the snake is one, non-different, while an element of difference appears if we view it with regard to its coils, hood, erect posture and so on." It is akin therefore to the expressions "a forest and its trees," "a lake and its waters," so often used by the Vedantists as illustrations of identity. The explanation given by Târânâtha in the *Vâchaspatyam* does not coincide with the above. He says:—"अहेः सर्पस्य यथा कुण्डलाकृतिवेष्टनं स्वाभाविकं तथा यस्य स्वाभाविकधर्मो व्यपदिश्यते तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥

आकाशमुष्टिहननन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *striking the sky with one's fist.* A vain attempt at an impossibility. It occurs in the Jaimini chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 133 of *Bib. Ind.* edition, and p. 151 of Jîvânanda's) as follows:—"**तस्मादुत्पत्तौ ज्ञप्तौ च परतस्त्वे प्रमाणसंभवात्स्वतःसिद्धं प्रामाण्यमित्येतत्पूतिकूष्माण्डायत इति चेत्तदेतदाकाश-मुष्टिहननायते**" ॥ Prof. Cowell has rendered it thus:—"Therefore, as we can prove that authoritativeness is both produced and recognized by means of something external, the Mîmâṁsâ tenet 'authoritativeness is self-proved' is like a gourd over-ripe and rotten. This long harangue of our opponent, however, is but a vain attempt to strike the sky with his fist."

Much older instances of the employment of the nyâya are the following:—*Tantravârtika*, page 170, "**यस्तन्तूननुपादाय तुरीमा-त्रपरिग्रहात् । पटं कर्तुं समीहेत स हन्याद्व्योम मुष्टिभिः**" ॥ [With this compare the words of a great modern preacher–Dr. Maclaren–"Logic without Revelation is like a spinning-machine without cotton, busy drawing out nothing"]. *Pancapâdikâ* page 43, line 19, "**तद्यदि नाम ज्ञानं लोके सिद्धं तथापि निरस्तप्रपञ्चात्मविषयमसिद्धमा-काशमुष्टिहननवन्न विधातुं शक्यम्.**" Then, in *Nyâyakandalî*, page 56, line 6, we find the cognate expression "**यथा कश्चिन्निशितं कृपाण-मच्छेद्यमाकाशं प्रति व्यापारयन्**", and again in *Nyâyakaṇikâ*, page 219.

उपयन्नपयन्धर्मो विकरोति हि धर्मिणम् ॥

The appearance or disappearance of a quality (or characteristic) *produces a corresponding change in the subject of it.* This nyâya is the second line of *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* ii. 35, the first being "**आगमापायिनिष्ठत्वादनित्यत्वमियादृशिः**" ॥ Although it is included in Raghunâtha's list, it ought not, strictly speaking, to find a place amongst *popular maxims*; but I insert it in order to make a necessary correction in the printed text of the *Sarvadaras'anasangraha* where it is quoted. On page 161

of the Bibliotheca Indica edition, and on page 182 of that prepared by Jîvânanda Vidyâsâgara, we read "ततश्चोपपन्नस्त्वयन्धर्मो विकरोति हि धर्मिणमिति न्यायेन" and this bad reading of course affects the translation as it appears on page 244 of the volume prepared for Trübner's Oriental Series by Professors Cowell and Gough. The explication given in *Vâchaspatyam* is as follows:—"यथा पूर्वस्य रूपरसादिरूपधर्मपरावृत्तौ रूपरसाद्यन्तरोत्पत्तौ च घटादेर्धर्मिणो विकृतिरेवं यस्य धर्मिणः पूर्वधर्मस्यापगमेऽन्यधर्मस्योत्पत्तिस्तत्रायं न्यायोऽवतरति" ॥

उष्ट्रकण्टकभक्षणन्यायः—

The maxim of *a camel's eating thorns.* This is not in Raghunâtha's list, but in the *Vâcaspatyam* it is explained thus:—"उष्ट्रस्य शमीकण्टकवेधजातदुःखकालेऽपि शमीपत्रभक्षणसुखलेशो यथा तथाभीष्टविषयोपार्जनदुःखकाले तदुपार्जितद्रव्यजसुखलेशो यत्रोपदिश्यते तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ I regard this, however, as quite beside the mark. In *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 2. 2. 1. Shankara, after combating at length the Sânkhya theory, that objects are *in themselves*, सुखदुःखमोहात्मक, says:—"शब्दाद्यविशेषेऽपि च भावनाविशेषात्सुखादिविशेषोपलब्धेः," which Dr. Thibaut renders—"And, further although the sense-object, such as sound and so on, is one, yet we observe that owing to the difference of the mental impressions (produced by it) differences exist in the effects it produces, one person being affected by it pleasantly, another painfully, and so on." On which Ânandagiri says:—"शब्दादीति। भावना तत्तज्जातियोग्या वासना तद्विशेषादुष्ट्रादीनां कण्टकादौ सुखादिदर्शनात् &c." Vâcaspatimis'ra, explains the same passage in the *Bhâmatî*, (pp. 380-1), pointing out that things are not *in themselves essentially* pleasent or unpleasent, and that what causes pleasure to one may be painful to another, and that even the same thing which at one time is agreeable may at another time be the reverse. Otherwise thorns would be as acceptable to men as they are to a camel. Here are his words:—"यदि पुनरेत एव सुखदुःखस्वभावा

भवेयुस्ततः स्वरूपत्वाद्धेमन्तेपि चन्दनः सुखः स्यात्। न हि चन्दनः कदाचिदचन्दनः। तथा निदाघेष्वपि कुंकुमपंकः सुखो भवेत्। न ह्यसौ कदाचिदकुंकुमपंकः। एवं कण्टकः क्रमेलकस्य सुख इति मनुष्यादीनामपि प्राणभृतां सुखः स्यात्। न ह्यसौ कांश्चित्प्रत्येवाकण्टक* इति। तस्मादसुखादिस्वभावा अपि चन्दनकुंकुमादयो जातिकालावस्थाद्यपेक्षया सुखदुःखादिहेतवो न तु स्वयं सुखादिस्वभावा इति रमणीयम्". A camel, then, eats thorns because it likes them; a man does not eat them because he does not like them. May not the maxim, therefore, be the equivalent of our "*What's one man's food is another man's poison?*" Mr. M. R. Telang has kindly pointed out *Vikramânkadevacarita* i. 29. as illustrating a camel's love of thorns.

एकमनुसन्धित्सतोऽपरं प्रच्यवते ॥

Whilst seeking for one thing he loses another. The saying appears twice, in this form, in the *Sarvadars'anasangraha.* The first instance is in the Ârhata Section (p. 27 of Bib. Ind. and 33 of Jîvânanda's edn.), translated by Professor Cowell:—"एतद्दोषपरिजिहीर्षया ज्ञानं जडतां नानुकरोतीति ब्रूषे हन्त तर्हि तस्या ग्रहणं न स्यादित्येकमनुसन्धित्सतोऽपरं प्रच्यवत इति न्यायापातः"। "If in your wish to escape this difficulty, you assert that 'the perception does not follow the object in being insentient,' then there would be no perception that the object is insentient, and so it is a case of the proverb, '*While he looks for one thing which he has lost, another drops.*"

The second example, from the Akshapâda section (pp. 118 and 134), is as follows:—"नन्वेकमनुसन्धित्सतोऽपरं प्रच्यवत इति न्यायेन दुःखवत्सुखमित्युच्छिद्यत इत्यकाम्योऽयं पक्ष इति चेन्मैवं मंस्थाः"।

"Nor may you retort on us that we have fulfilled the proverb of '*seeking one thing and dropping another in the search,*' since we have abolished happiness as being ever tainted with some incidental pain &c."

---

* The printed text wrongly reads कण्टक for अकण्टक.

In the *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhâdya* (page 447) and in Mallinâtha on *Târkikarakṣâ*, pp. 7 and 25, we meet with the nyâya in another form, namely "एकं सन्धित्सतोऽपरं प्रच्यवते" which means " Whilst trying to reunite one [piece of a broken vessel] another falls off."

एकवृन्तगतफलद्वयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *two fruits attached to one stalk.* Used by writers on Alankâra to illustrate a particular kind of *Paronomasia*, namely the coalescence of two meanings under one word. It was first pointed out to me by Mr. F. W. Thomas, Assistant Librarian to the India Office, he having met with it in the commentary on *Kâvyâdarś'a* ii. 310. I have since found it in use in the *Alankârasarvasva*, *Kâvyapradîpa*, *Sâhityadarpaṇa*, *Rasagangâdhara*, *Alankârakaustubha*, and *Sâhityakaumudî*, in each case under the figure श्लेष. The maxim finds a place in Marâṭhî literature also, and is regarded by Molesworth as equivalent to our proverb "Killing two birds with one stone."

कदम्बकोरकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the buds of the Kadamba tree.* They are said to burst forth simultaneously. As, for example, in Hemacandra's *Paris'ishṭaparvan* i. 241 :—

"पित्रा स्वपाणिपद्मेन स्पृश्यमानोऽवनीपतिः ।
उत्कोरककदम्बाभो बभूव पुलकांकुरैः" ॥

In the *Nyâyamanjarî*, pages 214 and 228, and in the *Bhâshâparichchheda* (verse 166) this nyâya is given as an illustration of the way in which sound is produced. The last-mentioned reads thus:—

"वीचीतरङ्गन्यायेन तदुत्पत्तिस्तु कीर्तिता ।
कदम्बकोरकन्यायादुत्पत्तिः कस्यचिन्मते" ॥

The commentary, *Siddhântamuktâvali*, however, explains कदम्बगोलकन्यायात् and this is the form given to the maxim in the *Vâchaspatyam* which explains it as follows:—"कदम्बगोलकस्य गोलाकारकदम्बस्य सर्वावयवेषु यथा युगपत्पुष्पोद्गम एवं सर्वप्रदेशेषु युगपद्यत्र प्रसारस्तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ In Vedantin Mahâdeva's comment on *Sânkhyasûtra* V. 103, we have a third form, namely कदम्बमुकुलन्याय.

कफोणिगुडन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *treacle on the elbow.* Used of something tantalizingly inaccessible. It is found in Udayana's *Âtmatattvaviveka*, page 26:—अस्तु तर्हि भावस्वरूपातिरिक्ता निवृत्तिर्नास्तीत्यस्य सोपाख्येति शेषः । नन्वयमपि क्षणभंगस्योद्धारः स च कफोणिगुडायितो वर्तते भवतु वा निवृत्तिरसमर्था तथाप्यहेतुकत्वे तस्याः किमायातम्" ॥ Then in the Akshapâda chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 116 of Bib. Indica, and 132 of Jîvânanda's edition) we read:—"ननु दुःखात्यन्तोच्छेदोऽपवर्ग इत्येतदद्यापि कफोणिगुडायितं वर्तते तत्कथं सिद्धवत्कृत्य व्यवह्रियत इति चेन्मैवम्" ॥ which Prof. Cowell translates as follows:—"But is not your definition of the *summum bonum*, liberation, that is, the absolute abolition of pain, after all as much beyond our reach as *treacle on the elbow is to the tongue*; why then is this continually put forth as if it were established beyond all dispute?" In a footnote he says, "Compare the English proverb 'As soon as the cat can lick her ear.'" In the *Vâchaspatyam*, however, the nyâya is explained an meaning the *absence* of a thing, not its inaccessibility. It says:—"कफोणौ गुडाभावेऽपि तदाशया यथा लेहनमेवं यत्र वस्त्वसद्भावेऽपि तत्प्रत्याशया व्यापारभेदस्तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ The St. Petersburg Lexicon (s. v. कफोणिगुडाय्) renders it "like a *ball* on the elbow."

काकतालीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the crow and the Palmyra fruit.* A crow alighted on a Palmyra tree, and at the same moment some of the fruit fell on its head and killed it. The maxim is therefore used to illustrate a startling and *purely accidental* occurrence. It is well explained in the *Kâs'ikâvṛitti* on *Pâṇini* 5. 3. 106 (as quoted by Dr. Eggeling in a footnote to *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 195):—"काकतालीयम्। अजाकृपाणीयम्। अन्धकवर्तकीयम्। अतर्कितोपनतं चित्रीकरणमुच्यते। तत्कथम्। काकस्यागमनं यादृच्छिकं तालस्य पतनं च। तेन तालेन पतता काकस्य वधः कृतः। एवमेव देवदत्तस्य तत्रागमनं दस्यूनां चोपनिपातः। तैश्च तस्य वधः कृतः। तत्र यो देवदत्तस्य दस्यूनां च समागमः स काकतालसमागमसदृशः" ॥

We find the saying in *Pañchadas'î* ix. 12 as follows:—"अयथावस्तुविज्ञानात्फलं लभ्यत ईप्सितम्। काकतालीयतः सोऽयं संवादिभ्रम उच्यते" ॥ And again in Ânandavardhana's *Dhvanyâloka* ii. 16, and in *Nyâyavârtikatâtparyaṭîkâ*, page 401. There is a capital example of it, too, in the following verses of the *Nyâyamanjarî* (page 106):—"अपि चानागतं ज्ञानमस्मदादेरपि क्वचित्॥ प्रमाणं प्रातिभं श्वो मे भ्रातागन्तेति दृश्यते ॥ नानर्थजं न सन्दिग्धं न बाधविधुरीकृतम्। न दुष्टकारणं चेति प्रमाणमिदमिष्यताम्॥ क्वचिद्बाधकयोगश्चेदस्तु तस्याप्रमाणता। यत्रापरेद्युरभ्येति भ्राता तत्र किमुच्यताम्॥ काकतालीयमिति चेन्न प्रमाणप्रदर्शितम्। वस्तु तत्काकतालीयमिति भवितुमर्हति" ॥ In his commentary on *S'ântiparva* clxxvii. 11, Nîlakaṇtha Govind gives another, and less probable, definition of the maxim. He says:—"तालः करतलयोः शब्दजनकः संयोगस्तस्मिन् क्रियमाणे उत्पतन्काको दैवात्तत्र तालाभ्यामाक्रान्तोऽभूत्तदेतत्काकतालीयमित्युच्यते। काकस्पर्शसमकालं तालफलस्य तालवृक्षस्य वा पतनं तदित्यन्ये" ॥ Molesworth explains it thus:—"Said when any occurrence synchronizing with, or immediately following, some other seems, however in truth independent of it, to have been *occasioned* by it;—as the fruit of a Palmyra falling at the alighting upon it of a crow, may appear to fall *in consequence.*"

काकदन्तपरीक्षान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the examination of a crow's teeth.* Used of any useless and manifestly fruitless enquiry. It occurs in the Buddhist treatise *Nyâyabinduṭîkâ*, page 1, and again on page 3, line 8. Also in S'ankara's bhâshya on *Kaṭha-Upanishad* i. 25 ["नचिकेतो मरणं मानुप्राक्षीः"]:—"नचिकेतो मरणं मरणसंबद्धं प्रश्नं प्रेत्यास्ति नास्तीति काकदन्तपरीक्षारूपं मानुप्राक्षीर्मैवं प्रष्टुमर्हसि" ॥ We find it too in Abhinavagupta on *Dhvanyâloka* iii. 19 (page 163 of Paṇḍit Durgâprasâda's edition) as follows:—"व्यंग्योऽर्थो भवतु मा वाभूत् कस्तत्राभिनिवेशः। काकदन्तपरीक्षाप्रायमेव तत्स्यादिति भावः" ॥ It appears also in *Pancapâdikâ*, pages 53 and 68, and in many works besides. In *Nyâyamanjarî*, page 7, line 5, it takes the form of वायसदशनविमर्शन्याय.

काकाक्षिगोलकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the crow's eyeball.* Crows are pupularly supposed to have only one eye, which, as occasion requires, moves from the cavity on one side into that on the other. The maxim is used of a word which appears only once in a sentence but which applies to two portions of it; or of persons or things fulfilling a double purpose. I have met with it in the former sense in Svâtmârâma's *Haṭhayogapradîpikâ* iv. 10, "विविधैरासनैः कुम्भैर्विचित्रैः करणैरपि," on which the commentator, Brahmânanda, says "विचित्रैरिति काकाक्षिगोलकन्यायेनोभयत्र संबध्यते." Also in Abhinavagupta's comment on *Dhvanyâloka* iii. 1, "पदानां स्मारकत्वेऽपि पदमात्रावभासिनः", where he remarks "अपिशब्दः काकाक्षिन्यायेनोभयत्रापि संबध्यते" ॥ Of its use in the second sense, we have an interesting example in Kâmandaki's *Nîtisâra*, a work ascribed to the third century before Christ. Chapter xi. 24 reads thus:—"बलिनोर्द्विषतोर्मध्ये वाचात्मानं समर्पयन् । द्वैधीभावेन वर्त्तेत काकाक्षिवदलक्षितः."

काशकुशावलम्बनन्यायः ।

The maxim of *catching at straws*. The being driven from one argument or position to another equally untenable. Târânâtha says "नद्यादौ पतितस्य संतरणानभिज्ञस्य यथा कुशकाशावलम्बनं निरर्थकमेवं प्रबलयुक्तिषु निराकृतासु दुर्बलयुक्त्यवलम्बनं निरर्थकमित्येवमवलम्बनस्य निरर्थकत्वविवक्षायामस्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ The expression "काशकुशावलम्बनकल्पं" occurs in the Ârhata chapter (p. 25 of Bib. Ind. and p. 31 of Jîvânanda's edition) of the *Sarvadars'anasangraha*, and again in the Pâṇini chapter (pp. 142 and 161); and in both places Prof. Cowell has rendered it "like a drowning man's catching at a straw." We have the same, though not as a compound, in *Naishkarmyasiddhi* i. 76,—"एवं निराकृतोऽपि काशं कुशं वावलम्ब्याह." It appears also in *Nyâyamanjarî* page 183; and again, as follows, on page 551:—"तस्मात्प्रमाणतोऽशक्ये शक्ये वा वस्तुनिर्णये। एवं प्रायमयुक्तं यत्कुशकाशावलम्बनम्" ॥ In *Tantravârtika* 1. 3. 18 (page 213) we have the maxim in the following couplet:—"अर्थवत्त्वं न चेज्जातं मुख्यैर्यस्य प्रयोजनैः। तस्यानुषङ्गिकेष्वाशा कुशकाशावलम्बिनी" ॥

In expounding *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 3. 3. 29, Ânandagiri quotes *Amarkos'a* 2. 4 166 (अस्त्री कुशं कुशो दर्भः पवित्रमथ कत्तृणम्) as follows:—"अत एवास्त्री कुशमित्यमरसिंहेनानुशिष्टम्." Does this throw any new light on the date of Amara? In his *History of Indian Literature* (page 230), Professor Weber tells us that the *Amarakos'a* cannot be widely separated from those dictionaries which we know to belong to the eleventh, twelfth, and following centuries; whilst Professor Macdonell, in his recently issued *History of Sanskrit Literature* (page 433) assigns that work to about 500 A. D.

कूपमण्डूकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a frog in a well*. It is applied to an inexperienced person brought up in the narrow circle of home, and

ignorant of public life and mankind. "Home-keeping youth have ever homely wits" (*Two Gentlemen of Verona* i. 1). The following passage from *Prasannarâghava-Nâṭaka* i. (page 13) illustrates the use of the term:—"कथं मामपि दशदिग्विलासिनी-कर्णपूरीकृतकीर्तिपल्लवं त्रिभुवनवीरनामधेयं कूपमण्डूक इव सागरमविख्यातमप-दिशसि" ॥ So, too, *Upamitibhavaprapancâ*, page 828:—

"यो न निर्गत्य निःशेषां विलोकयति मेदिनीम् ।
अनेकाद्भुतवृत्तान्तां स नरः कूपदर्दुरः" ॥

कूपयन्त्रघटिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the pots attached to the water-wheel of a well.* As the wheel revolves, some of the pots are going up and others are going down; some are full whilst others are empty; and so it is applied to illustrate the changes and chances of this mortal life. This is well put in *Mṛichchhakaṭika* x. 60:—

"कांश्चित्तुच्छयति प्रपूरयति वा कांश्चिन्नयत्युन्नतिं
कांश्चित्पातविधौ करोति च पुनः कांश्चिन्नयत्याकुलान् ।
अन्योन्यं प्रतिपक्षसंततिमिमां लोकस्थितिं बोधय-
न्नेष क्रीडति कूपयन्त्रघटिकान्यायप्रसक्तो विधिः" ॥

Târânâtha's explanation of this maxim is extremely tame, not to say nonsensical! According to him, it is intended to teach that as a pot is raised by the water-wheel from a deep well, so, by means of instruction, the essence of the S'âstras is drawn up, deep though they are by reason of their complexity! See the cognate घटीयन्त्रन्याय in *Second* and *Third Handful.*

कूर्माङ्गन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the limbs of the tortoise.* Its meaning and application will be apparent from the following passage taken from the Sânkhya section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 150 Bib. Ind. and 170 of Jîvânanda's edition):—"यथा हि कूर्म-

स्याङ्गानि कूर्मशरीरे निविशमानानि तिरोभवन्ति निःसरन्ति चाविर्भवन्त्येवं कारणस्य तन्त्वादेः पटादयो विशेषा निःसरन्त आविर्भवन्त उत्पद्यन्त इत्युच्यन्ते निविशमानास्तिरोभवन्तो विनश्यन्तीत्युच्यन्ते । न पुनरसतामुत्पत्तिः सतां वा विनाशः" ॥ Prof. Cowell renders it thus:—"As the limbs of a tortoise, when they retire within its shell, are concealed, and, when they come forth, are revealed, so the particular effects, as cloth &c., of a cause, as threads &c., when they come forth and are revealed, are said to be produced; and when they retire and are concealed, they are said to be destroyed; but there is no such thing as the production of the non-existent, or the destruction of the existent." Very similar language is used by Vâchaspati Mis'ra, too, in his *Sânkhyatattvakaumudî* 9 and 15. See also, *Kshurikâ-Upanishad* 3, and *Gîtâ* ii. 58.

कृत्वाचिन्तान्यायः ॥

The nyâya stands thus in *Tantravârtika* 3. 4. 1:—"यस्तु भाष्यकारेणोपन्यासः कृतः स कृत्वाचिन्तान्यायेनेति द्रष्टव्यम्." On applying to my friend Mr. Arthur Venis for an elucidation of the nyâya he replied as follows:—"I have always understood it as the method of granting to your adversary what later you mean to refute, for which another common expression is अभ्युपगमवाद. The word कृत्वा is elliptical for इति कृत्वा, that is, having admitted your adversary's point, you proceed to the चिन्ता or discussion of it." This view seems to be confirmed by the fact that in *S'âstradîpikâ*, pages 615, 666, 707, 710, and 739, it takes the form of "इति कृत्वा चिन्त्यते," and that in S'abara on Jaimini 11. 3. 16, and 12, 2. 11, we read at the close of each "इत्येवं कृत्वा चिन्त्यते । कृत्वाचिन्तेयम्."

In his *Ṣaḍdars'anacintanikâ*, Mr. M. M. Kunte gives three different renderings of the expression. On page 650 (where it is attached to the title of the *adhikaraṇa*) its meaning is said to be "a point already discussed," and he claims for it the authority of Mâdhava; then, on page 1999, it

is rendered "an adjustment not founded on fact;" and, finally, on page 2040, "the examination of a subject after merely granting an opponent's statement." This third rendering coincides with that of Mr. Venis.

I may add that Prof. Gangânâtha Jhâ tells me that a pandit would explain the term thus:—"कृत्वा (यद्यप्येतद्विषयकसंशयो नोदेति तथापि तद्विषयगतसकलविचारस्योपन्यासार्थं कल्पनां कृत्वा) चिन्ता (विचारः)." Or, as the Professor himself puts it, "the bhâsya has introduced certain points of discussion simply for *the sake of argument*, in order to exhaust all possible alternatives with regard to the subject matter of the adhikaraṇa." I have not met with the nyâya anywhere but in works on Mîmâṃsâ.

क्षीरं विहायारोचकग्रस्तस्य सौवीररुचिमनुभवति ॥

"*Leaving the milk suitable to the dyspeptic, he enjoys the sour gruel.*" The nyâya is found in this form in the Akshapâda section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (p. 118 of *Bib. Ind.* edition and p. 134 of Jîvânanda's ed.) as follows:—"ननु सुखाभिव्यक्तिर्मुक्तिरिति पक्षं परित्यज्य दुःखनिवृत्तिरेव मुक्तिरिति स्वीकारः क्षीरं विहायारोचकग्रस्तस्य सौवीररुचिमनुभवतीति चेत्तदेतन्नाटकपक्षपतितं त्वद्वच इत्युपेक्ष्यते" ॥

Prof. Cowell translates it thus:—"But if you give up the view that liberation is the manifestation of happiness, and then accept such a view as that which holds it to be only the cessation of pain, does not your conduct resemble that of the dyspeptic patient who refused sweet milk and preferred sour rice-gruel? Your satire, however, falls powerless, as fitter for some speech in a play [rather than for a grave philosophical argument]." There can be little doubt however that Mâdhava took the nyâya from Udayana's *Âtmatattvaviveka* where it appears (on page 56, line 5,) as "क्षीरं विहाय रुचिररोचकग्रस्तस्य सौवीरे." I know of no other instance of it, and it is not in Raghunâtha's *Laukikanâyasangraha*.

खल्वाटबिल्वीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the bald* (or *bare-headed*) *man, and the woodapple.* Vardhamâna (iii. 195) explains it thus:—"यथा खल्वाटः पर्यटन्नतर्कितं श्रीफलतरोरधस्तादागतो दैववशाच्च बिल्वमुपरि पतितं तद्वदन्योऽप्युभयवस्तुसंयोग एवमुच्यते" ॥ Bhartṛihari, in his *Nîtis'ataka* 90, brings the bald man under a *palm* tree:—

"खल्वाटो दिवसेश्वरस्य किरणैः संतापितो मस्तके
वाञ्छन्देशमनातपं विधिवशात्तालस्य मूलं गतः ।
तत्राप्यस्य महाफलेन पतता भग्नं सशब्दं शिरः
प्रायो गच्छति यत्र भाग्यरहितस्तत्रैव यान्त्यापदः" ॥

This maxim belongs to the same class as अजाकृपाणीय and काकतालीय, which see.

गगनरोमन्थन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *ruminating on ether.* Equivalent to beating the air. It is found twice in the *Sarvadaras'anasangraha.* First, in the Râmânuja section (page 57 of Jîvânanda's edition, and 47 of Bib. Ind.):—"तदेतद्गगनरोमन्थायितम्", which Prof. Gough renders "All this is about as profitable as it would be for a ruminant animal to ruminate on ether." Secondly in the Pâṇini section (pages 162 and 143 respectively):—"तदेतद्गगनरोमन्थकल्पम्", rendered by Prof. Cowell by "All this is only the ruminating of empty ether." In the *Nyâyamanjarî* page 453, it appears in a slightly different form, in the expression "व्योम्नि रोमन्थकेलिवत्;" and in *S'âlikâ* p. 154, and *Nyâyamakaranda*, page 129, we meet with गगनग्रासकल्प.

गड्डरिकाप्रवाहन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a continuous rush of sheep.* It is used to indicate the blind following of others like a flock of sheep. So the *Vâchaspatyam*, which says:—"गड्डलिकानामवीनां संघादेका

चेन्नद्यादौ पतति तदा तत्संघान्तर्गताः सर्वेऽपि वार्यमाणा अपि तत्र पतन्तीति लोकप्रसिद्धया यत्र वार्यमाणानामपि अनिष्टमार्गे धावनं तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ The expression occurs in chap. viii. (page 214) of the *Kâvya-prakâs'a* where a very helpful note of Mahes'achandra's will be found; and also in chap. vi, page 188, of the *Sâhityadarpaṇa*, which however, Mr. Pramadâdâsa Mitra has rendered, "in pursuance of established custom."

It is found, also, on pages 86 and 125 of Abhinavagupta's commentary on the *Dhvanyâloka*, and in the opening part of *Kâvyapradîpa* viii. (p. 327). There seems to be much difference of opinion as to the correct form of the first word of the maxim, since it appears in the four varieties of गड्डरिका, गड्डलिका, गड्डारिका and गड्डालिका.

गुडजिह्विकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the tongue* [smeared] *with treacle* [in order to disguise an unpalatable draught]. The *Vâchaspatyam* thus explains its use:—"यथा तिक्तताभिया निम्बपानमकुर्वाणस्य बालस्य जिह्वायां गुडलेपं दत्त्वा पित्रादिस्तं निम्बं पाययति एवमर्थवादवाक्यानि बह्वायाससाध्ये कर्मण्यप्रवर्त्तमानं पुरुषं स्वर्गाक्षय्यादिकं श्रावयित्वा प्रवर्त्तयन्ति। फलश्रुतिरपि रोचनार्था"॥

An excellent example of this is found in *Kâvyapradîpa*, p. 7:—"ये सुकुमारमतयोऽतिसुखिस्वभावा राजकुमारादयो नीरसे नीतिशास्त्रे प्रवर्तयितुमशक्यास्तान्काव्यं कान्तेव सरसतापादनेनाभिमुखीकृत्योपदेशं ग्राहयति गुडजिह्विकया शिशूनिवौषधम्। यथाहुः।

स्वादुकाव्यरसोन्मिश्रं वाक्यार्थमुपभुञ्जते।
प्रथमालीढमधवः पिबन्ति कटु भेषजम्" ॥

It is employed in a similar manner by Abhinavagupta in his comment on *Dhvanyâloka* iii. 30, and by the author of *Padamanjarî* in the early part of his work (the Paṇḍit x. 254); and, somewhat less clearly, in *Bhâmatî*, pages 342, 534, and *Nyâyavârtikatâtparyatîkâ*, pages 438, 441.

गोबलीवर्दन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the cattle and the bull.* In the *Paṇḍit* for October 1867, Râjârâma S'âstrî expounded it thus:—"यत्र गाः कालय बलीवर्दं चेत्युच्यते तत्र गोपदेनैव बलीवर्दपदसिद्धौ बलीवर्दपदं दुर्दम्यत्वज्ञापनपरत्वेन सफलमिति कल्प्यते" ॥ That given in the *Vâchaspatyam* is somewhat fuller:—"बलीवर्दस्य गोविशेषत्वेऽपि बलीवर्दस्य झटिति गोत्वेन बोधनार्थं यथा प्रयोगस्तथान्ययोः सामान्यविशेषरूपयोर्झटिति बोधनार्थं यत्र प्रयोगस्तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ In his exposition of *Manu* viii. 28, where six classes of women are enumerated as having a claim to the king's protection, Kullûka says:—"अत्र चानेकशब्दोपादाने गोबलीवर्दन्यायेन पुनरुक्तिपरिहारः" ॥ The commentators Râghavânanda and Govindarâja also quote the maxim in the same connection, and we have it in *Kâvyapradîpa* vii. 11 (page 300). Vâcaspatimis'ra, too, makes frequent use of it. It occurs in *Bhâmatî*, pages 518, 536; and in *Nyâyavârtikatâtparyaṭîkâ*, pages 11, 118, 119 and 404. It belongs to the same class as ब्राह्मणवसिष्ठन्याय and ब्राह्मणपरिव्राजकन्याय.

गोमयपायसीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *cowdung as a milky preparation.* Some stupid person is supposed to argue that cowdung is made of milk, because it comes from the cow; hence it is used to denote an utterly absurd argument or statement. It occurs in Vyâsa's bhâshya on *Yogasûtra* i. 32. He says:—"कथंचित्समाधीयमानमप्येतद्गोमयपायसीयन्यायमाक्षिपति" ॥ On which the *Yogavârtika* remarks:—"गोमयं पायसं गव्यत्वादित्यादिन्यायमतदूषणं समाधीयमानमप्याक्षिपति तिरस्करोति" ॥ See, too, *Nyâyavârtikatâtparyaṭîkâ*, p. 435.

It is found also in the Bauddha section of the *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 18 of Bib. Ind. and 22 of Jîvânanda's edition) in the following sentence:—"एवं चायमभेदसाधको हेतुर्गोमयपायसीयन्यायवदाभासतां भजेत्", which Professor Gough renders "Thus this argument which you adduce to prove that there is

difference between subject and object, turns out a mere absurdity, *like milky food made of cowdung.*"

The compound गोमयपायसीय is included in *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 196, but Vardhamâna did not explain it.

घट्टकुटीप्रभातन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *day-break in the vicinity of the toll-collector's hut.* A man, anxious to avoid paying toll, takes another road, but losing his way in the dark, finds himself, at day-break in the vicinity of that very toll-gate! The saying is employed to illustrate उद्देश्यासिद्धि, as Prof. Cowell puts it; that is, failure to accomplish a desired object. It occurs in the Pâṇini section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* as follows:—"ननु स्फोटवाचकतापक्षेऽपि प्रागुक्तविकल्पप्रसरेण घट्टकुटीप्रभातायितमिति चेत्तदेतन्मनोराज्यविजृम्भणं वैषम्यसंभवात्", which is thus rendered by Prof. Cowell:—"But even on your own hypothesis that there is a certain thing called *sphoṭa* which expresses the meaning, the same untenable alternative will recur which we discussed before; and therefore it will only be a case of the proverb that *'the dawn finds the smuggler with the revenue-officer's house close by'*. This, however, is only the inflation of the world of fancy from the wide difference between the two cases."

S'rîharsha, too, used the simile in his *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhâdya* (page 35):—"तर्हि कारणस्य सत्तामभ्युपगतवानसीति घट्टकुट्यां प्रभातमिति चेन्न" ॥ See also *Siddhântales'a*, pages 40 and 116; *Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha*, page 62; *Advaitabrahmasīddhi*, pages 63, 146, 219, 371; *Citsukhî*, i. 12; ii. 24 (Paṇḍit iv. 518; v. 510), and *Kusumânjali* iii. 16 (page 496).

घुणाक्षरन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the letter made by the wood-worm ghuṇa.* This worm bores holes in wood and in books which sometimes assume the shape of a letter of the alphabet; hence its use to

intimate the occurrence of something quite accidental. Here is Vardhamâna's (iii. 195) description of it:—"घुणोत्किरणात्कथंचिन्निष्पन्नमक्षरं घुणाक्षरम् । तदिव यदकुशलेन दैवान्निष्पद्यते तद्घुणाक्षरीयम्" ॥

The simile is found in the opening part of the *Prasannarâghava* (page 9) as follows:—"अहो घुणाक्षरन्यायो यदिदं भ्रमरद्वयं प्रति मयोक्तं बन्दिद्वयं प्रति फलितं वचः" ॥ Also in *Râjatarañgiṇî* iv. 167:—"त्रीन्वारान्समरे जित्वा जितं मेने स मुम्मुनिम् । सकृज्जयमरेर्वीरा मन्यन्ते हि घुणाक्षरम्" ॥ *Mâgha* iii. 58 may also be referred to.

चन्द्रचन्द्रिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the moon and its light.* Used of two inseparable things. It is found in Ânandagiri's *S'ankaravijaya*, page 124:—"अतः सर्वदेवकारणस्य रुद्रस्य या शक्तिश्चन्द्रचन्द्रिकान्यायेन तदुद्भोधरूपिणीस्वाधीनवल्लभेति प्रसिद्धा सैव भवानी" ॥

चौरापराधान्माण्डव्यनिग्रहन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the punishment of Mâṇḍavya for the crime committed by robbers.* The story of the Ṛishi Aṇî-Mâṇḍavya is told at length in *Âdiparva* cvii, cviii. Whilst he was practising severe austerities, in conjunction with the *mauna-vrata*, some robbers concealed themselves and their plunder in his Âs'rama. The king's guard found them there, and, believing the sage to be implicated in the affair, carried him off together with them and impaled them all together! Mâṇḍavya was eventually removed from the stake, but its point (अणी) remained in him; hence the name, given him by the people, of Aṇî-Mâṇḍavya. The maxim is found in the Pûrṇaprajna chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 73 of Jîvânanda's edition, and 62 of Bib. Ind.):—"तस्मान्न भेदप्रत्यक्षं सुप्रसरमिति चेत्किं वस्तुस्वरूपभेदवादिनं प्रति इमानि दूषणान्युद्भुष्यन्ते किंवा धर्मिभेदवादिनं प्रति । प्रथमे चौरापराधान्माण्डव्यनिग्रहन्यायापातः" ॥ But its earliest occurrence is in *Âtmatattvaviveka*, page 70, line 15, where we read "एवं हि चौरापराधेन

व्यक्तमयं माण्डव्यनिग्रहः स्यात्" ॥ and it was from this source that the Khaṇḍanakâra, too, derived the nyâya together with several pages of context! Compare pages 633-636 of S'rîharṣa's work with pages 70 and 71 of Udayana's.

छत्रिन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the men with umbrellas.* The thought here is of a crowd of men, *many* of them with umbrellas up, and so *all* seeming to have them. Its application will be apparent from the examples which follow. We have one in S'ankara's bhâshya on *Kaṭha-Upanishad* iii. 1 ("ऋतं पिबन्तौ" &c.):—"एकस्तत्र कर्मफलं पिबति भुङ्क्ते नेतरस्तथापि पातृसंबन्धात्पिबन्तावित्युच्यते छत्रिन्यायेन" ॥ Again, in his bhâshya on *Vedântasûtra* 3. 3. 34, where the same text is expounded:—"ऋतं पिबन्तावित्यत्र तु जीवे पिबत्यशनायाद्यतीतः परमात्मापि साहचर्याच्छत्रिन्यायेन पिबतीत्युपचर्यते" ॥ On the former of these two passages, the commentator Gopâla Yatîndra says:—"छत्रिन्यायेनेति । यथा लोके छत्रिणो गच्छन्तीति प्रयोगे सपरिवारे राज्ञि गच्छति छत्र्यछत्रिसमुदाये छत्रिशब्दो वर्तत एकसमूहवाहित्वेनैवं पिबदपिबत्समुदाये पिबतिर्वर्त्तत इत्यर्थः ॥

I have met with the maxim in the *Kuvalayânanda* also under the figure उल्लास, and in Ânandagiri on *Brahmasûtra-bhâshya* 1. 2. 11; 1. 4. 12.

But the nyâya is found long before S'ankara's time, and perhaps originated with S'abara, in whose bhâshya on Jaimini 1. 4. 28 we read "यथा छत्रिणो गच्छन्तीत्येकेन छत्रिणा सर्वे लक्ष्यन्ते"; and in *Tantravârtika* 1. 4. 13 "तस्मादेकदेशस्थैरपि विश्वेदेवैरुपलक्षितानां छत्रिन्यायेन तत्प्रख्यतयैव सर्वेषां नामधेयत्वम्" ॥

तमोदीपन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *darkness and the lamp.* This is found in the *Vedântasiddhântamuktâvali* (page 125) where we read:—

"तदयं तमोदीपन्यायः । तथाहि । अज्ञानं ज्ञातुमिच्छेद्यो मानेनात्यन्तमूढधीः । स तु नूनं तमः पश्येद्दीपेनोत्तमतेजसा" ॥ "Hence the well-known illustration of darkness and the lamp:—Thus that dullest of dull-heads who would cognize Nescience by means of a pramâṇa, would forsooth go looking for darkness with a brilliant lamp."

This verse is most probably based on that of Sures'vara in *Taittirîyavârtika* 2. 1. 177:—

"प्रमाणोत्पन्नया दृष्ट्या योऽविद्यां द्रष्टुमिच्छति ।
दीपेनासौ ध्रुवं पश्येद्बुहाकुक्षिगतं तमः" ॥

दग्धपटन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the burnt cloth.* When a piece of cloth, or a leaf, is thrown into the fire and consumed, its outline is still visible in the charred remains; and this the Vedântists use to illustrate the unreality and unsubstantiality of all phenomena. It occurs twice in Nṛisiṁhasarasvatî's commentary on the *Vedântasâra*, namely on pages 55 and 66, as follows:—"यद्वा सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्मैतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वमित्यादिश्रुतिबलात्सर्वमहमिति गिरिनदीसमुद्रात्मकं सर्वं जगत्स्वाभिन्नसच्चिदानन्दब्रह्मत्वेनानुभूय तस्य दग्धपटन्यायेन प्रपञ्चभानेऽप्यद्वैतं सच्चिदानन्दलक्षणं वस्तु भासत एवेत्यर्थः" ॥ (Page 55).

"नन्वेतादृशस्य जीवन्मुक्तस्य देहेन्द्रियादिभानमस्ति न वेत्याशङ्क्य दग्धपटन्यायेनेन्द्रजालनिर्मितसौधसमुद्रादिवच्च बाधितानुवृत्त्या मिथ्यात्वेन भानेऽपि परमार्थतया भानं नेत्याह अयमित्यादिना न पश्यतीत्यन्तेन" ॥ (Page 66).

दण्डापूपिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the stick and the cakes.* If a number of cakes (chapâṭis) are attached to a stick, and the stick is carried off or eaten by mice, the inference is that the cakes have shared the same fate. The application of the maxim is obvious. In the *Sâhityakaumudî* (xi. 8), and in the *Kuvalayânanda* (page 244), it is used to illustrate the figure अर्थापत्ति and काव्यार्थापत्ति respectively.

"दण्डापूपिकयान्यार्थागमोऽर्थापत्तिरिष्यते ॥ ८ ॥ मूषिकेण दण्डो भक्षितश्चेदिहस्थः पूपोऽपि तेन भक्षित इति न्यायो दण्डापूपिका । तयान्यार्थागमोऽर्थान्तरप्रत्ययोऽर्थापत्तिरित्यर्थः" ॥ (*Sâh.*)

"कैमुत्येनार्थसंसिद्धिः काव्यार्थापत्तिरिष्यते*। स जितस्त्वन्मुखेनेन्दुः का वार्ता सरसीरुहाम् ॥ अत्र स इत्यनेन पद्मानि येन जितानीति विवक्षितं तथा च सोऽपि येन जितस्तेन पद्मानि जितानीति किमु वक्तव्यमिति दण्डापूपिकान्यायेन पद्मजयरूपस्यार्थस्य संसिद्धिः काव्यार्थापत्तिः । तात्त्रिकाभिमतार्थापत्तिव्यावर्तनाय काव्येति विशेषणम्" ॥ (*Kuv*).

See also *Bṛihadâraṇyakopanishad-bhâshyavârtika*, page 909, verse 135.

देहलीदीपन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a lamp on the threshold*. A lamp so placed gives light both inside and outside the house, and is therefore used as an illustration of anything which fulfills a double purpose. S'abara refers to such a lamp in his bhâshya on *Jaimini* 12. 1. 3:—"यथा प्रासादे कृतः प्रदीपः सन्निधानाद्राजमार्गेऽप्युपकरोति". There is a similar expression, too, in *Kuvalayânanda*, page 97. Another good example of the nyâya is found in the commentary on *Saptapadârthî*, page 52. The text stands thus:—"द्रव्यानारंभकं कार्यद्रव्यमन्त्यावयवि ॥ प्रागभाववत्कार्यम् ॥ भोगायतनमन्त्यावयवि शरीरम्" ॥ on which Mâdhava Sarasvatî remarks:—"शरीरलक्षणेऽन्त्यावयविपदज्ञानाय तल्लक्षणमाह द्रव्येति । यद्यप्युद्देशानन्तरं लक्षणस्य वक्तव्यत्वाच्छरीरलक्षणानन्तरं भोगादिवदन्त्यावयवी लक्षयितुमुचितस्तथाप्यत्र द्रव्यपदव्यवच्छेद्यत्वेन प्राप्तत्वाद्देहलीप्रदीपन्यायेनोभयत्रोपकार्यतयात्रैव लक्षित इत्यदोषः" ॥

My friend Professor Cowell pointed out another instance of the use of the nyâya in Ânandagiri's *S'ankaravijaya* xi, page 82. The maxim is akin to काकाक्षिगोलकन्याय and जामात्रर्थं श्रपितस्य सूपादेरतिथ्युपकारकत्वम् ॥

---

* The author of *Rasagangâdhara* finds fault with this definition. See page 487 of Durgâprasâda's edition, Bombay 1888.

नष्टाश्वदग्धरथन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the lost horses and burnt chariot.* This is based on the story of two men travelling in their respective chariots, and one of them losing his horses and the other having his chariot burnt, through the outbreak of a fire in the village in which they were putting up for the night. The horses that were left were harnessed to the remaining chariot, and the two men pursued their journey together. Its teaching is—union for mutual advantage. That the story is very old is clear from the fact that the saying is quoted in the 16th *vârtika* ("संप्रयोगो वा नष्टाश्वदग्धरथवत्") to *Pâṇini* 1. 1. 50, and again in S'abara's *bhâshya* 2. 1. 1. It appears also in Sures'vara's *Bṛihadâraṇya-bhâshyavârtika* 2. 1. 38, which reads thus:—"नष्टाश्वदग्धरथवन्न्यायं चाश्रित्य भूभिपम्। प्राह मानुषवित्ताढ्यं दैववित्तसमन्वितः" ॥ On which Ânandagiri says:—"अधिकारिणे विद्यां वक्तुं गार्ग्यश्चेदुपचक्रमे तर्हि योग्यं ब्राह्मणं हित्वा किमिति राजानमुपेत्य ब्रवीति। तत्राह नष्टेति। यथाहुर्युक्तः संयोगोऽधिकारार्थेन हेतुना नष्टाश्वदग्धरथवदिति" ॥

Râmatîrtha, too, quotes the maxim in his comment on the *Vedântasâra* (page 93, line 3):—"नष्टाश्वदग्धरथन्यायेन 'कर्मणा पितृलोक' इति श्रुतिरुपपद्यते", of which the following translation is found in *The Paṇḍit* for May 1872:—"The Vedic text 'The world of progenitors is attained by works,' can be explained according to the analogy of two men, of whom the horses of the one are lost and the chariot of the other burnt [for the horses of the latter may be yoked to the car of the former, and they may travel together; and in like manner, constant and occasional works, though no special result has been recorded of them, may supply a cause for the attainment of the world of the progenitors, which requires some special works as a condition]." See also *Tantravârtika*, pp. 15, 709, 832, and *Bhâmatî*, page 81.

नहि कठोरकण्ठीरवस्य कुरङ्गशावः प्रतिभटो भवति ॥

A young fawn cannot stand up against a full-grown lion.

This is found in the Akshapâda chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 136 of Jîvânanda's, and 119 of Bib. Ind.):—"नैतत्परीक्षाक्षममीक्ष्यते नहि कठोरकण्ठीरवस्य कुरङ्गशावः प्रतिभटो भवति", which Prof. Cowell renders, "This pretended inference will no more stand examination than the young fawn can stand the attack of the full-grown lion." Compare "नाल्पीयसा महतोऽभिभवः संभवति" ॥ of *S'âlikâ*, Page 94, and see the nyâya "नहि भवति तरक्षुः &c." in *Second Handful.*

नहि खदिरगोचरे परशौ पलाशे द्वैधीभावो भवति ॥

The Palās'a tree is not cleft when the axe is applied to the Khadira tree. The saying is used to indicate that two objects are essentially distinct. I have met with it in three of Vâcaspatimis'ra's works.

It occurs in *Bhâmatî* 2. 2. 28 (page 438) in the following connection. "स्वरूपं विज्ञानस्यासत्याकारयुक्तं प्रमेयम्। प्रमेयप्रकाशनं प्रमाणफलं, तत्प्रकाशनशक्तिः प्रमाणम् । बाह्यवादिनोरपि वैभाषिकसौत्रान्तिकयोः काल्पनिक एव प्रमाणफलव्यवहारोऽभिमत इत्याह 'सत्यपि बाह्येऽर्थे' इति। भिन्नाधिकरणत्वे हि प्रमाणफलयोस्तद्भावो न स्यात्। नहि खदिरगोचरे परशौ पलाशे द्वैधीभावो भवति। तस्मादनयोरैकाधिकरण्यं वक्तव्यम्" ॥

Then in *Yogabhâs'yatîkâ* i. 7 we read:—"ननु पुरुषवर्ती बोधः कथं चित्तगताया वृत्तेः फलम्। नहि खदिरगोचरव्यापारेण परशुना पलाशे छिदा क्रियत इति" ॥

And very similarly in *Nyâyavârtikatâtparyat̤îkâ*, page 67:—"अथ प्रमाणफलयोर्भिन्नविषयत्वेन विप्रतिपत्त्या प्रमाणफलभावायोगात्। नहि पनसविषयेण परशुना खदिरे द्वैधीभावो भवति" ॥ But he is not the only writer who makes use of it, for in *Advaitabrahmasiddhi*, page 93, we read:—"तयोर्भिन्नाधिकरणवृत्तित्वे खदिरगोचरे परशौ पालाशे द्वैधीभावो भवेत्" ॥ For earlier references to this nyâya, see the Superaddenda to the *Third Handful.*

न हि वरविघाताय कन्योद्वाहः ॥

The bride is not married for the destruction of the bridegroom. This is found in *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 4. 1. 2, and in the Pûrṇaprajna chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 63 of Bib. Ind., and 75 of Jîvânanda's edn.). It occurs also in *Jîvanmuktiviveka*, page 101 (line 4 from bottom). In the *Vâchaspatyam* and in the *Laukikanyâyasangraha*, the maxim is given in the *positive* form, *viz.* "वरघाताय कन्यावरणम्" with the other as a possible variant. Târânâtha explains it thus:—"विषकन्यायां वृतायां यत्र वरस्य घातः संभाव्यते तत्र तां नोद्वहेदेवं विवक्षायामस्य प्रवृत्तिः । तथा चानिष्टान्तरपातादिसंभावनायामभीष्टहेतुरपि वस्तु न वरणीयमित्येवं तन्न्यायतात्पर्यम् । अयमेव न्यायः क्वचिन्न हि वरघाताय कन्यामुद्वाहयतीति न्यायतया पठ्यते" ॥ We have a reference to "poison-damsels" in *Kathâsaritsâgara* xix. 82, which reads thus:—"विदधे विषकन्याश्च सैन्ये पण्यविलासिनीः । प्राहिणोत्पुरुषांश्चैव निशासु च्छद्मघातिनः" ॥ In a foot-note to his translation of the passage, Mr. Tawney says, "One of these poison-damsels is represented as having been employed against Chandragupta in the Mudrâ-Râkshasa. Compare the xi th tale in the Gesta Romanorum, where an Indian queen sends one to Alexander the Great. Aristotle frustrates the stratagem."

पङ्कप्रक्षालनन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the washing off of mud.* It is evidently deduced from *Pañchatantra* ii. 157, a verse intended to strengthen an argument against the possession of riches under any circumstances, and which reads thus:—"धर्मार्थं यस्य वित्तेहा तस्यापि न शुभावहा । प्रक्षालनाद्धि पङ्कस्य दूरादस्पर्शनं वरम्" ॥ "If a man desires wealth for charitable purposes, even to him it will bring no good; for, better than the washing off of mud is the keeping away from it altogether." The nyâya is therefore the equivalent of our "Prevention is better than cure." In his bhâshya on *Brahmasûtra* 3. 2. 22. S'ankara twice quotes the second line of the above couplet; and, in commenting thereon, Ânandagiri uses the maxim three times. It is again applied twice by him

on *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 4. 1. 16. as follows:—"अग्निहोत्रादीनामपि पुण्यान्तरवद्विनाश्यत्वात्पङ्क्षालनन्यायापातादारुरुक्षुणापि तानि नानुष्ठेयानि"; "धीनाश्यानामपि कर्मणामनुष्ठानस्य विद्योत्पत्त्यर्थतया पङ्क्षालनन्यायानवकाशात्पूर्वं ज्ञानादनुष्ठेयान्यग्निहोत्रादीनीति सिद्धान्तप्रतिज्ञां विवृणोति." See also *Bhâmatî* and *Bhâshyaratnaprabhâ* on the same, and *Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha*, page 97, line 14.

पङ्ग्वन्धन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the lame man and the blind man.* The conception is that of a lame man mounted on the shoulders of one who is blind, so that the former is furnished with the power of locomotion and the latter with sight. It is intended to illustrate mutual dependence for mutual advantage, as exemplified in *Sânkhyakârikâ* 21, the text of which, with Colebrooke's translation, is as follows:—"पुरुषस्य दर्शनार्थं कैवल्यार्थं तथा प्रधानस्य। पङ्ग्वन्धवदुभयोरपि संयोगस्तत्कृतः सर्गः" ॥ "For the soul's contemplation of Nature, and for its abstraction, the union of both takes place, as of the halt and blind. By that union a creation is framed." Vâchaspati Mis'ra ignores the illustration, but Paṇḍit Târânâtha has a helpful note on it. He says:—"उक्तार्थे दृष्टान्तः पङ्ग्वन्धवदिति। यथा गतिशक्तिरहितस्य पङ्गोर्गतिसाधनाय गतिमतोऽन्धस्यापेक्षा, दृष्टिशक्तिरहितस्य चान्धस्य गतिशक्तिसत्त्वेऽपि स्वाभीष्टदेशगमनं दर्शकमन्तरेण न संभवति तथा च यथा स्वस्वकार्याय तयोरन्योन्यापेक्षा तथा क्रियारहितस्य पुरुषस्य सक्रियप्रधानस्यापेक्षा दृष्टिशक्तिरहितस्य च प्रधानस्य दृष्टिशक्तियुक्तपुरुषस्यापेक्षेत्यत उभाभ्यामन्योन्यमपेक्ष्य स्वस्वकार्यं निष्पाद्यत इत्यर्थः" ॥ The above *kârikâ* is quoted on the last page of the Sânkhya section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha*, and is preceded by a very clear explanation of the maxim.

पञ्जरचालनन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the moving of the bird-cage.* An illustration of the power of united effort. In a discussion on *prâṇa*, under *Vedântasûtra* 2. 4. 9, S'ankara introduces this maxim and

explains it thus:—"ननु पञ्जरचालनन्यायेनैतद्भविष्यति । यथैकपञ्जरवर्तिन एकादशपक्षिणः प्रत्येकं प्रतिनियतव्यापाराः सन्तः संभूयैकं पञ्जरं चालयन्ति । एवमेकशरीरवर्तिन एकादशप्राणाः प्रत्येकं प्रतिनियतवृत्तयः सन्तः संभूयैकां प्राणाख्यां वृत्तिं प्रतिलप्स्यन्त इति" ॥ Dr. Thibaut translates the passage as follows:—"But, an objection may be raised, the thing may take place in the manner of the moving [of the?] bird-cage. Just as eleven birds shut up in one cage, may, although each makes a separate effort, move the cage by the combination of their efforts, so the eleven prâṇas which abide in one body may, although each has its own special function, by the combination of these functions, produce one common function called prâṇa."

पाटच्चरलुण्ठिते वेश्मनि यामिकजागरणम् ॥

The vigilance of the watchman after the house has been plundered by thieves. Equivalent to our proverb "Shutting the stable door after the horse is gone." It occurs in *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhâdya*, page 45:—"प्रयोजनानुपयुक्ते काले तस्य स्वरूपतोऽवस्थानं पाटच्चरलुण्ठिते वेश्मनि यामिकजागरणवृत्तान्तमनुहरति" ॥

पिण्याकयाचनार्थं गतस्य खारिकातैलदातृत्वाभ्युपगमः ॥

He went to crave the leavings of the oil-seed, and had instead to agree to give 16 *measures of oil.* Used of one completely worsted in argument. I render पिण्याक in accordance with its meaning in *Pañchatantra* iii. 99("श्रेयस्तैलं च पिण्याकात्"). The maxim is found in the Pûrṇaprajna section of the *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 63 of Bib. Ind., and 75 of Jîvânanda):—"सोऽयं पिण्याकयाचनार्थं गतस्य खारिकातैलदातृत्वाभ्युपगम इव", which Prof. Gough render:—"And thus it must be allowed that, in raising the objection, you have begged for a little oil-cake, and have had to give us gallons of oil."

पिष्टपेषणन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the grinding of that which is already ground.* Fruitless reiteration, unproductive repetition. The oldest in-

stance, known to me, of the employment of the nyâya, is by S'abara on Jaimini 9. 2. 3:—"न हि स्निग्धस्य स्नेहनं शक्यं कर्तुं पिष्टस्य वा पेषणम्". It occurs again in 12. 2. 16, and in *Tantravârtika*, pp.54 and 477. We find it likewise in S'ankara's bhâshya on *Kena-Upanishad* 32:—"यदि तावच्छ्रुतस्यार्थस्य प्रश्नः कृतस्ततः पिष्टपेषणवत्पुनरुक्तोऽनर्थकः प्रश्नः स्यात्" ॥, and in Sudars'anârya's comment on *Âpastamba-Grihyasûtra* xiv. 9 ("पुंसवनं व्यक्ते गर्भे तिष्येण"), where he says "इदमपि सीमन्तवत्प्रथम एव न तु प्रतिगर्भं पिष्टपेषणन्यायात्" ॥ Compare तुषकण्डनन्याय in *Second Handful*.

प्रदीपे प्रदीपं प्रज्वाल्य तमोनाशाय यतमानः ॥

Trying to remove the dimness of a lamp by lighting another. Used of foolishly superfluous and misdirected effort. It occurs in *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhâdya*, page 294:—"लघोरुपायात्साध्यसिद्धौ भवन्त्यां···गुरावुपाये प्रवर्तमानस्य तवैवेदं दोषोद्भावनं प्रदीपे प्रदीपं प्रज्वाल्य तमोनाशाय यतमानस्येव पुंसः" ॥ In a footnote, the editor says:—"प्रदीपं प्रज्वाल्य प्रदीपे तमोनाशाय यतमानस्य पुंस इवेत्यन्वयः."

In *Upades'asâhasrî* xvii. 41 (page 215), we read:—"न हि दीपान्तरापेक्षा यद्वद्दीपप्रकाशने । बोधस्यात्मस्वरूपत्वान्न बोधोन्यस्तथेष्यते"; and, in Sures'vara's *Bṛihadâraṇyakavârtika* 4. 3. 501:—"ननु दीपः स्वमात्मानं स्वात्मनैवावभासयन् । दृष्टो दीपप्रकाशार्थं न हि दीपान्तराहृतिः" ॥ See also *Nyâyamanjarî*, page 625, on *Nyâyasûtra* 5. 1. 10.

प्रधानमल्लनिबर्हणन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the destruction of the chief antagonist.* The principle that when the most formidable enemy has been defeated, the less formidable are already virtully overcome. In the bhâshya on *Vedântasûtra* 1. 4. 28 ("एतेन सर्वे व्याख्याता व्याख्याताः") we read:—"अतः प्रधानमल्लनिबर्हणन्यायेनातिदिशति । एतेन प्रधानकारणवादप्रतिषेधन्यायकलापेन सर्वेऽप्वादिकारणवादा अपि प्रतिषिद्धतया व्याख्याता वेदितव्याः" ॥ Here, there is undoubtedly a play on the word प्रधान, the Sânkhya theory of the Pradhâna being the chief antagonist met and overcome in the foregoing Sûtras

and bhâshya. The same expression appears again in the bhâshya on *Sûtra* 2. 1. 12, and the maxim is found, too, in the Râmânuja chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 54 of Jîvânanda's edition, and p. 45 of Bib. Ind. edition).

बीजाङ्कुरन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *an eternal series of seed and shoot.* As the seed produces the shoot, so the latter in turn reproduces the former. Each therefore is a cause and an effect. The maxim is met with very frequently in the literature. We find it in *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 2. 1. 36 (on the eternity of the world) as follows:—"न च कर्मान्तरेण शरीरं संभवति । न च शरीरमन्तरेण कर्म संभवतीतीतरेतराश्रयत्वप्रसङ्गः । अनादित्वे तु बीजाङ्कुरन्यायेनोपपत्तेर्न कश्चिद्दोषो भवति", which is rendered thus by Dr. Thibaut:—"Without merit and demerit nobody can enter into existence, and again, without a body merit and demerit cannot be formed; so that—on the doctrine of the world having a beginning—we are led into a logical see-saw. The opposite doctrine, on the other hand, explains all matters in a manner analogous to the case of the seed and sprout, so that no difficulty remains." It occurs again at the end of the *bhâshya* on 3. 2. 9. Also in the Ârhata section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 31 of Bib. Ind., and 37 of Jîvânanda), in Râmatîrtha's commentary on *Vedântasâra* (page 110), and in *Panchapâdikâ*, page 12, line 12.

ब्राह्मणपरिव्राजकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the Brâhmans and the mendicants.* In such a sentence as ब्राह्मणा भोजयितव्याः परिव्राजकाश्च the separate mention of the latter, who are really included in the former term, merely emphasizes their position as a special part of the general body. It is thus the exact paralled of the गोबलीवर्दन्याय and of the ब्राह्मणवसिष्ठन्याय. It is used by S'ankara three times in his exposition of the *Vedântasûtras*, namely under 1. 4. 16, 2. 3. 15, and 3. 1. 11; but I forbear to quote his words, for without a

lengthy portion of context they would be unintelligible. It appears also in *Tantravârtika*, pages 423, 590.

ब्राह्मणवसिष्ठन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the Brâhmans and Vasishṭha*. This is of the same type as ब्राह्मणपरिव्राजकन्याय, which see. Satyavrata gives as a reference "हलन्त्यं-सूत्रभाष्यं," *i. e.* Patanjali on *Pâṇini* 1. 3. 3. But the reference is a pure delusion; and I think I may safely say that the maxim is not to be found in any part of the *Mahâbhâshya*. It would not be unreasonable, however, to infer that the author of the *Padamanjarî* had this nyâya in view when he penned the following:—वैदिकानां लौकिकत्वेऽपि प्राधान्यख्यापनार्थं पृथग्ग्रहणं यथा ब्राह्मणा आगता वसिष्ठोऽप्यागत इति" ॥ (*The Paṇḍit*, vol. x, page 282). Compare तक्रकौण्डिन्यन्याय in *Second handful*.

ब्राह्मणश्रमणन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the Brâhmana-ascetic*. The श्रमण is a Buddhist ascetic, and therefore not a Brâhman,—but the expression ब्राह्मणश्रमण implies that though now a Buddhist he was formerly a Brâhman. The maxim is used by the authors of the *Kâvya-prakâs'a* (page 68) and the *Sâhityadarpaṇa* (article 257) in exactly the same connexion. After giving an example of 'suggested meaning' in the form of 'semblance of contradiction' (विरोधाभास), the author of the latter work says:—"अत्रामित इत्यादावपिशब्दाभावाद्विरोधाभासो व्यङ्ग्यः । व्यङ्ग्यस्यालंकार्यत्वेऽपि ब्राह्मण-श्रमणन्यायादलंकारत्वमुपचर्यते", which Mr. Pramadâdâsa Mitra renders thus:—"Here, from the absence of the particle अपि after the words अमित &c., the semblence of the ornament named 'contradiction' is suggested. The suggested meaning, though strictly what is ornamented, is figuratively spoken of here as the ornament, with reference to its being an ornament in another condition [*i. e.* when it is *expressed*, not suggested], just as we use the word Brâhman-mendicant, which, though it

etymologically means an absurdity, *viz.* a mendicant, or one not a Brâhman, who is a Brâhman, tropically signifies one who *was* a Brâhman."

भक्षितेऽपि लशुने न शान्तो व्याधिः ॥

Although the garlic has been eaten the disease is not cured. This proverb is applied as follows by Nṛisimhasarasvatî in his comment on the opening verse of the *Vedântasâra*:—"ननु भक्षितेऽपि लशुने न शान्तो व्याधिरिति न्यायेन प्रपञ्चस्याधिष्ठानव्यतिरिक्ततया प्रतीयमानत्वात्कथमद्वैतसिद्धिरित्याशङ्कां तृणीकुर्वन्नाह अखण्डमिति" ॥ It is found also in *Vedântakalpataruparimala*, page 37.

भिक्षुपादप्रसारणन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a beggar's obtaining a firm footing* [in a patron's house]. Perhaps approaching our "give him an inch and he will take an ell." Târânâtha explains it thus:—"यथा कश्चिद्भिक्षुर्यथेष्टभोजनाच्छादनवासगृहादिलाभार्थं कस्यचिद्धनिनो गृहे प्रविश्य युगपत्सर्वाभीष्टालाभं मन्यमानः प्रथमं धनिगृहे मे पादप्रसारणमस्तु पश्चादनेन परिचयमुत्पाद्य सर्वमभीष्टं संपादयिष्यामीति धिया स्वल्पामपि भिक्षां बहुमन्यमानः पश्चात्क्रमेण स्वाभीष्टं संपादयत्येवं यत्र विवक्षा तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥

It occurs in the Bauddha chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 14 of Bib. Ind. edn.) as follows:—"माध्यमिकास्तावदुत्तमप्रज्ञा इत्थमचीकथन्भिक्षुपादप्रसारणन्यायेन क्षणभङ्गाद्यभिधानमुखेन स्थायित्वानुकूलवेदनीयत्वानुगतसर्वसत्यत्वभ्रमव्यावर्तनेन सर्वशून्यतायामेव पर्यवसानम्" ॥ Here is Prof. Gough's rendering:—"The Mâdhyamikas, excellently wise, explain as follows, namely that the doctrine of Buddha terminates in that of a total void (universal baselessness or nihilism) by a slow progression *like the intrusive steps of a mendicant*, through the position of a momentary flux, and through the (gradual) negation of the illusory assurances of pleasurable sensibility, of universality, and of reality."

I have met with one other example only, namely in Venkaṭanâtha's *Tattvamuktâkalâpa*, page 254:—"अस्त्वेवमिति चेन्न भिक्षु-

पादप्रसारणन्यायेन निरीश्वरवादावतारादतः क्रोधावश्यम्भावादीश्वरस्यापि दुःखावश्यम्भावः" ॥ The subject under discussion here is आगमिकेश्वरसिद्धि. For the cognate expression पादप्रसारिका see the *Second Handful*.

मणिमन्त्रादिन्यायः ॥

The nyâya of *a gem or charm* &c. [as an obstructer or exciter of fire &c., by its presence or absence]. This obscure nyâya is not in Raghunâthavarma's collection, but is defined as follows in the *Vâcaspatyam*, page 4166:—"मणिमन्त्रादीनां वह्नेर्दाहं प्रति यथा स्वातन्त्र्येण प्रतिबन्धकत्वं लोकसिद्धं न च तत्र युक्त्यपेक्षा एवं कामिनीजिज्ञासाया अपि ज्ञानमात्रं प्रति प्रतिबन्धकत्वमित्येवं यत्र पृथक् प्रतिबन्धकत्वं तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥

I am much indebted to Mr. Arthur Venis for the following note elucidating the nyâya:—"In their analysis of the notion of cause and effect many Indian writers distinguish between those cases in which the processes that intervene (*avântara-vyâpâra*) between the cause and its final product (*kârya*) are known by ordinary experience (*lokasiddha*), and those other cases in which the intermediate stages are not thus known. Of the latter cases, while we know as a fact (say these writers) that, for example, a *maṇi* or a *mantra* will produce a certain effect or prevent it from coming into existence, we are quite unable to explain the rationale of the process in terms of ordinary experience. All that can be said in such cases is that the *maṇi* or the *mantra* has the power (*s'akti*) to produce this or hinder that result. This postulate of a power transcending ordinary experience is the मणिमन्त्रादिन्याय, and its proper application (*pravṛitti*) is to the class of causes thus roughly described. If I remember rightly, another, and to us westerns a more interesting, example of this nyâya is the double fact of *attention to* something and *attention away from* something else. The lover, intent on discovering his mistress (*Kâminî-jijnâsâ*), is psychologically dead to all that does not

concern her. But *how* should his attention *to* her cause attention *away from* all the world beside? Here, says the Indian psychologist, analysis of the *how* can proceed no further. The postulate of the मणिमन्त्र must be applied here; or, in other words, we can only say that *attention to* a thing has the power to cause (*s'akti*) *attention away from* something else." This question is discussed in *Kusumânjali* i. 10, and Prof. Cowell's translation of the *kârikâ* and Haridâsa's comment will be found helpful. I have met with the nyâya in the *Sankṣ'epa-s'ârîraka* iii. 87, 88, 91; in *Tattvamuktâkalâpa* iv. 103, and better still, in v. 99; and in *Vidvanmaṇḍana*, page 59.

मण्डूकप्लुतिन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a frog's leap*. Used by grammarians and others to express the passing from one rule to another over intervening ones. I noted it in the following portions of the *Mahâbhâshya*:—1. 1. 3 (vârt. 2); 5. 2. 4 (2); 6. 1. 17 and 3. 49; and 7. 2. 117. I have met with it also in Jayaratha's commentary on *Alankârasarvasva* 20 ("विषयस्यापह्नवेऽपह्नुतिः"), where he says:—"केचन मण्डूकप्लुतिन्यायेनानुवर्तनस्यानुचितत्वाद्भ्रान्तिमदनन्तरमपह्नुतिर्ग्रन्थकृता लक्षिता उल्लेखश्चातिशयोक्त्यनन्तरमिति ग्रन्थं विपर्यासितवन्तः। न चैतत्" ॥ See, too, *Bhâmatî* 1. 3. 39, and Ballantyne's *Aphorisms of the Nyâya*, ii. 80.

मध्यदीपिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the central lamp*. The idea is of a lamp in a central position shedding its light on all sides. It occurs in the *Muṇḍaka-bhâshya* 1. 1. 3 (शौनको ह वै महाशालोऽङ्गिरसं विधिवदुपसन्नः पप्रच्छ):—"शौनकाङ्गिरसोः संबन्धादर्वाग्विधिवद्विशेषणादुपसदनविधेः पूर्वेषामनियम इति गम्यते। मर्यादाकरणार्थं मध्यदीपिकान्यायार्थं वा विशेषणम्" ॥ Also in Râmatîrtha on *Vedântasâra* (page 129):—मध्यप्रदीपन्यायेनोत्तरत्रापि जाग्रद्वासनेत्यत्र कोशत्रयपदं संबध्यते", which is thus ren-

dered by Prof. Gough (in the *Paṇḍit* for Feb. 1873, p. 212):—"The term triad of sheaths has a double connection [with both the preceding and following clauses], after the manner of a lamp placed in the middle of a door [and throwing light both inwards and outwards]." The following from *Nyâyamanjarî*, page 212, further illustrates the nyâya:—"गृहे दधिघटीं द्रष्टुमानीतो गृहमेधिना । अपूपानपि तद्देशान्प्रकाशयति दीपकः" ॥ Akin to this is मध्यमणिन्याय, which is explained in the *Paṇḍit* for Dec. 1867 as referring to the central ruby of a nose-ring which casts a lustre on the pearl on each side of it.

मानाधीना मेयसिद्धिः ॥

To know the thing to be measured you must know the measure. This is quoted in the opening part of the Akshapâda section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha*:—"मानाधीना मेयसिद्धिरिति न्यायेन प्रमाणस्य प्रथममुद्देशे तदनुसारेण लक्षणस्य कथनीयतया प्रथमोद्दिष्टस्य प्रमाणस्य प्रथमं लक्षणं कथ्यते" ॥ Prof. Cowell's translation is as follows:—"In accordance with the principle that 'to know the thing to be measured you must first know the measure,' proof (pramâṇa) is first enunciated, and as this must be done by defining it, we have first a definition of proof." We find it too, in *Tattvapradîpikâ* (or *Citsukhî*) ii. 18, as follows: "मानाधीना मेयसिद्धिर्मानसिद्धिश्च लक्षणात् । तच्चाध्यक्षादिमानेषु गीर्वाणैरपि दुर्भणम्" ॥ Compare also the following from **Sankshepas'ârîraka* (i. 487):—"मानेन मेयावगतिश्च युक्ता धर्मस्य जाड्याद्विधिनिष्ठकाण्डे । मेयेन मानावगतिस्तु युक्ता वेदान्तवाक्येष्वजडं हि मेयम्" ॥ See, too, *Vivaraṇaprameyasangraha*, page 86, and *Sânkhyakârikâ* 4 ("प्रमेयसिद्धिः प्रमाणाद्धि").

मुञ्जादिषीकोद्धरणन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the extraction of the interior spike of the*

---

* Its author, Sarvajnâtmamuni, was a pupil of Sures'varâcârya. See Mr. K. B. Pâṭhak's valuable paper *Bhartṛihari and Kumârila* (1892), page 24.

Munja grass. The following verse from the *Pañcadas'î* (i. 42), with an extract from Râmakṛishṇa's comment thereon will fully explain the meaning and application of the saying:—"यथा मुञ्जादिषीकैवमात्मा युक्त्या समुद्धृतः । शरीरात्रितयाद्धीरैः परं ब्रह्मैव जायते" ॥ "यथा येन प्रकारेण मुञ्जादेतन्नामकात्तृणविशेषादिषीका गर्भस्थं कोमलं तृणं युक्त्या बहिरावरकत्वेन स्थितानां स्थूलपत्राणां विभजनलक्षणेनोपायेन समुद्रियत एवमात्मापि···शरीरात्रितयात्···धीरैः···समुद्धृतः पृथक् कृतश्चेत्स परं ब्रह्मैव जायते" ॥ The illustration is a very ancient one, since it is employed in *S'atapatha Brâhmaṇa* 4. 3. 3. 16, and in *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* vi. 17. The latter instance is as follows:—"तं स्वाच्छरीरात्प्रवृहेन्मुञ्जादिवेषीकां धैर्येण." For the former, see this nyâya in the Superaddenda to *Third Handful.* It is found also in *Bṛihadâraṇyakavârtika* 4. 4. 1277.

याचितकमण्डनन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *borrowed ornaments.* Appearing in borrowed plumes. It is well illustrated by *Naiṣadhacarita* vii. 56:—"अस्या मुखश्रीप्रतिबिम्बमेवं जलाच्च तातान्मुकुराच्च मित्रात् । अभ्यर्थ्य धत्तः खलु पद्मचन्द्रौ विभूषणं याचितकं कदाचित्" ॥ On which Mallinâtha comments thus:—"याचितकं याच्ञानिर्वृत्तम्"। याच्ञयासं याचितकमित्यमरः। अपमित्ययाचिताभ्यां कक्कनाविति कन्प्रत्ययः (Pâṇ. 4. 4. 21)। विभूषणं कदाचिदभ्यर्थ्य धत्तो दधाते खलु। एतदीयमेव सुहृल्लब्धमनयोर्याचितं मण्डनं न स्वाभाविकमित्युत्प्रेक्षा". In the above form the nyâya is found in *Târkikarakṣâ,* page 46:—"तेनायथार्थस्यापि यथार्थानुभवजानितत्वेन यथार्थत्वव्यपदेश इति याचितकमण्डनकमनीयमेव स्मृतेर्याथार्थ्यम्." As याचितमण्डन I have met with it in *Khaṇḍanoddhâra,* page 62, and in *Kâvyapradîpaṭîkâ* of Vaidyanâtha Tatsat, page 173.

लोष्टप्रस्तारन्यायः ॥

This occurs in Abhinavagupta's comment on *Dhvanyâloka* iii. 16 (page 159) in the following sentence:—"तेन लोष्टप्रस्तारन्यायेनानन्तवैचित्र्यमुक्तम्," and in the first edition I said that it

could only mean the maxim of *an expanse of clods of earth* [as in a roughly ploughed field]. Regarding however प्रस्तार as a mislection for प्रस्तर it would mean the maxim of *a stone and a clod of earth*, and would be synonymous with अश्मलोष्टन्याय of the dictionaries. Mr. M. R. Telang (of the Bombay High Court) has however kindly suggested the following, with which I was quite unfamiliar. He says:—"लोष्ट means a pebble and प्रस्तार a table showing the varieties of metres &c. formed by different arrangements of the short and long syllables in prosody, music &c. The Indians make use of this process to find out the number of varieties of any number of given things. So the meaning of the nyâya can be better explained by the expression the maxim of *the process of permutations and combinations.*

It may be asked what लोष्ट (a pebble) has to do with permutations and combinations. In finding out the number of varieties of any number of given things, a pebble is used for marking certain figures according to the Indian process with the help of प्रस्तार, खण्डमेरु, नष्टोद्दिष्ट &c. These processes are well known to any one conversant with books on Indian music or prosody. The following references to books on the subject will support my statement. *Vide* संगीतरत्नाकर Chap. i verses 61 to 69 (pages 57–60); संगीतदर्पण Chap. i ver. 144 to 154."

वरं सांशयिकान्निष्कादसांशयिकः कार्षापणः ॥

Better is a certain kârshâpaṇa than an uncertain nishka. This and the proverb immediately following are found in the second chapter of Vâtsyâyana's *Kâmasûtra* (page 19), and are the equivalents of our saying "A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush."

वरमद्य कपोतः श्वो मयूरात् ॥

Better is a pigeon to-day than a peacock tomorrow. See above.

विपुलकदलीफललिप्सया जिह्वाच्छेदनम् ॥

Cutting off the tongue while trying to get a fine plantain. This is found in the Pûrṇaprajna section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 64 of Bib. Ind., and 75 of Jîvânanda's edn.) as follows:—"एवं च परमेश्वराभेदतृष्णया विष्णोर्गुणोत्कर्षस्य मृगतृष्णिकासमत्वाभिधानं विपुलकदलीफललिप्सया जिह्वाच्छेदनमनुहरत्येतादृशविष्णुविद्वेषणादन्धतमसप्रवेशप्रसङ्गात्" ॥ Prof. Gough renders it thus:—"Thus the statement of those (Advaita-vâdins) in their thirst to be one with the Supreme Lord, that the supreme excellence of Vishṇu is like a mirage, is as if they were to cut off their tongues in trying to get a fine plantain, since it results that through offending this supreme Vishṇu they must enter into the hell of blind darkness."

विषकृमिन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *worms bred in poison* (or, *in manure*). Âpṭe's Dictionary alone gives us this nyâya which he describes as follows:—"It is used to denote a state of things which though fatal to others, is not so to those who, being bred in it, are inured or naturalized to it." In this case it might represent our "What is one man's food is another man's poison." Âpṭe gives no reference to a passage where the maxim is used, and I am indebted for one to that veritable *Ratnâkara*, Dr. Böhtlingk's *Indische Sprüche* (6164). It consists of a quotation from *Vṛiddha-Câṇakhya*, a work which appears to exist in MS. only. It runs thus:—

विप्रास्मिन्नगरे महान्कथय कस्तालद्रुमाणां गणः
को दाता रजको ददाति वसनं प्रातर्गृहीत्वा निशि।
को दक्षः परदारवित्तहरणे सर्वोऽपि दक्षो जनः
कस्माज्जीवसि हे सखे विषकृमिन्यायेन जीवाम्यहम् ॥

The Doctor renders the last line by "Wozu lebst du, o

Freund? Ich lebe nach Art des Mistkäfers (d. i. Ich suche das Beste heraus)." If this is correct, the nyâya must be expressive of "living in clover," or, amidst "marrow and fatness!"

विषवृक्षन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the poisonous tree.* This appears to be based on the second half of *Kumârasambhava* ii. 55 (or *Pañcatantra* i. 245), which runs thus:—"विषवृक्षोऽपि संवर्ध्य स्वयं छेत्तुमसाम्प्रतम्." "It would be improper to cut down even a poisonous tree after cultivating it oneself." This is used as a maxim by the author of *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhâdya* (page 727) in the following sentence:—"एते सर्वे तर्काः...अस्माभिरेव तर्कपदव्यामभिषिक्तास्ततो न प्रबन्धेन निरस्यन्ते 'विषवृक्षोऽपि संवर्ध्य स्वयं छेत्तुमसाम्प्रतमिति'" ॥ There is another capital instance of it in *Upamitibhāvaprapancâ Kathâ*, page 715:—"हा हा मयेदं नो चारु कृतं यत्सुतभर्त्सनम्। विषवृक्षोऽपि संवर्ध्य स्वयं छेत्तुमसाम्प्रतम्" ॥

वीचीतरङ्गन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *wave-undulation.* This is used by the author of the *Bhâshâpariccheda* (verses 165, 166) to account for the production of sound. He says—"सर्वः शब्दो नभोवृत्तिः श्रोत्रोत्पन्नस्तु गृह्यते। वीचीतरङ्गन्यायेन तदुत्पत्तिस्तु कीर्तिता। कदम्बकोरकन्यायादुत्पत्तिः कस्यचिन्मते" ॥ Almost the same words are used by Vedântin Mahâdeva (latter part of 17th century) in his comment on *Sânkhyasûtra* V. 103:–किंतु शब्द एव वीचीतरङ्गन्यायेन कदम्बमुकुलन्यायेन वा श्रोत्रदेशं गतः श्रोत्रेण गृह्यते". "But sound comes to the seat of hearing in the same manner as the undulating waves [of water], or as the anthers of a [globulous] Kadamba flower and is thus apprehended by the ear." The translation, is Dr. R. Garbe's.

वृद्धकुमारीवाक्यन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the request of the aged spinster*. This is recorded in *Mahâbhâṣhya* 8. 2. 3 as follows:—"अथवा वृद्धकुमारीवाक्यवदिदं द्रष्टव्यम्। तद्यथा। वृद्धकुमारीन्द्रेणोक्ता वरं वृणीष्वेति सा वरमवृणीत पुत्रा मे बहुक्षीरघृतमोदनं कांस्यपात्र्यां भुञ्जीरन्निति। न च तावदस्याः पतिर्भवति कुतः पुत्राः कुतो गावः कुतो धान्यम्। तत्रानयैकेन वाक्येन पतिः पुत्रा गावो धान्यमिति सर्वं संगृहीतं भवति" ॥ This would be applied to a sentence having a variety of meanings. In *Tantravârtika* 2. 2. 2 (page 452) we meet with it as वृद्धकुमारीवरप्रार्थन; and in the *Paṇḍit* for December 1867 (page 156) we find exactly the same kind of thing under the heading वृद्धब्राह्मणवरन्यायः. This worthy was not only old but blind, and his request was "स्वपौत्रं राजसिंहासनस्थितमीक्षितुमिच्छामीति."

वृद्धिमिष्टवतो मूलमपि ते नष्टम् ॥

Wishing to grow, you have destroyed your root. This is Prof. Cowell's rendering of the saying as it appears in the *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 27 Bib. Ind., p. 33 Jîvânanda):—"तथा च वृद्धिमिष्टवतो मूलमपि ते नष्टं स्यादिति महत्कष्टमापन्नम्" । In the *Vâcaspatyam*, however, we have the literal and more usual meaning of the nyâya, namely "Whilst seeking to obtain interest, the creditor loses [that and] the capital too." "वृद्धिमिष्टवतो मूलमपि विनष्टमिति न्यायः । वृद्धिर्धनप्रयोगेऽधमर्णात्प्राप्यांशभेदलाभः। तामिष्टवत उत्तमर्णस्याधमर्णदौष्ठ्याद्यथा मूलं नश्यत्येवं यत्राभीष्टान्तरसंपादनाय प्रयतमानस्य मूलं नश्यति तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ See also *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhâdya*, p. 31; *Pancadas'î*, vii. 81; *Vedântakalpataru*, page 321; and *Syâdvâdamanjarî*, page 19. An amusing illustration of this saying is found in *Kuvalayânanda*, under the figure विषम. "इष्टार्थमुद्दिश्य किंचित्कर्मारब्धवतो न केवलमिष्टस्यानवाप्तिः किन्तु ततोऽनिष्टस्यापि प्रतिलंभश्चेत्तदपि विषमम्। यथा भक्ष्यप्रेप्सया सर्पपेटिकां दष्ट्वा प्रविष्टस्य मूषकस्य न केवलं भक्ष्यालाभः किन्तु स्वरूप-

हानिरपीति" ॥ Raghunâtha has two other maxims of the same kind, namely, "पुत्रलिप्सया देवं भजन्त्या भर्तापि नष्टः", and "चर्म-तन्तौ महिषीं हन्ति."

शरपुरुषीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the man and the arrow.* Vardhamâna explains this, as follows, in his comment on *Ganaratnamahodadhi* iii, 196:—"शरश्च क्षिप्तः प्राकाराच्च पुरुष उत्थितः स तेन हतः। तत्तुल्यं शरपुरुषीयम्" ॥ An arrow is discharged from a bow, and at the same moment a man rises up from behind a wall and is killed by it. It illustrates, therefore, a purely accidental and unforeseen occurrence, and must be classed with the अजाकृपाणीय, खल्वाटबिल्वीय, and others of a like nature.

शर्करोन्मज्जनीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the pebble and the* [man's] *emerging* [from the water]. This, like that immediately preceding, is found in Vardhamâna's work, and on the same page. He explains it thus:—"शर्करा च क्षिप्ता पुरुषस्य चोन्मज्जनं तत्तुल्यं शर्करोन्मज्जनीयम्" ॥ At the moment that the pebble is thrown, a man who has been diving or swimming emerges from the water and is struck by it. This, too, therefore, belongs to the अजाकृपाणीय and काकतालीय category.

शिरश्छेदेऽपि शतं न ददाति विंशतिपञ्चकं तु प्रयच्छतीति शाकटिकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the carter who would be beheaded rather than pay a hundred, but will at once give five score!* It

occurs in the Pûrṇaprajna section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 71 of Bib. Ind. and page 83 of Jîvânanda's) as follows:— "ननु प्रपञ्चस्य मिथ्यात्वमभ्युपेयते नासत्त्वामिति चेत्तदेतत्सोऽयं शिरश्छेदेऽपि शतं न ददाति विंशतिपञ्चकं तु प्रयच्छतीति शाकटिकवृत्तान्तमनुहरेन्मिथ्यात्वासत्त्वयोः पर्यायत्वादित्यलमतिप्रपञ्चेन" ॥ "If you say that you accept the falsity of the universe, but not its unreality, you are simply acting like the carter who would lose his head rather than pay a hundred pieces of money, but at once gives five score ! For falsity and unreality are synonymous. But enough of prolixity."

It is found also in *Âtmatattvaviveka* (page 31), from which Mâdhava probably took it. In *Tattvamuktâkalâpa* ii. 71 (page 244) it takes the form of "शतमदित्सतः शतार्धद्वयदानम्", and there is still another variety of it in *Khaṇḍanoddhdra*, page 74, namely "शिरच्छेदेऽपि काकणीं न ददाति पञ्चगण्डकांस्तु ददाति." Compare with this the following from *Nyâyamanjarî*, page 432:—"अथोच्यते न प्रत्यक्ष आत्मा किंत्वपरोक्ष इति नेदमर्थान्तरवचनं शिशव एवं प्रतार्यन्ते न प्रामाणिकाः" ॥

शीर्षे सर्पो देशान्तरे वैद्यः ॥

A snake in the head, and the doctor in another country ! This occurs, in Prâkṛit, in *Karpûramanjarî* iv. (page 100). It is found in somewhat similar form in *Mudrârâkshasa* i. 21, also in Prâkṛit. The *chhâyâ* is as follows. "उपरि घनं घनरटितं दूरे दयिता किमेतदापतितम्। हिमवति दिव्यौषधयः शीर्षे सर्पः समाविष्टः" ॥

शुकनलिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the parrot and the Nalikâ-tree.* Illustrative of causeless fear. In *Udyoga-Parva* xcvi. 42 we read "काकुदीकं शुकं नाकमक्षिसंतर्जनं तथा"। on which the commentator Nîlakaṇṭha says:— "काकुदीकमित्यादयोऽष्टावस्त्रजातयः ।...येन शुकनलिकान्यायेन अभयेऽपि भयदर्शिनो हयरथादिपादेषु गाढं श्लिष्यन्ति तच्छुक

ಪುಟ್ಟುವಿಲೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ...P.2.Sa.13

मोहनं नाम" ॥ I have met with it also in a MS. (No. 233 of 1882-83 in Deccan College, Poona) of Nârâyaṇa's commentary on *Gopâlottaratâpanîya-Upanishad* 8 (corresponding with 21 and 22 of *Bib. Ind.* edition), where, expounding the words "यो हि वै कामेन कामान्कामयते &c.," he says:—"वास्तवं कर्तृभोक्तृत्वं बन्धमोक्षादिकमात्मनो नास्ति किंतु स्वकामपरिकल्पितं शुकनलिकान्यायेन" ॥

शृङ्गग्राहिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *seizing oxen by their horns.* That is, by way of *specification,* and not in the sense of our proverb 'Taking the bull by the horns!' This is very clearly put in Râmakṛishṇa's commentary on S'ankarânanda's *Âtmapurâṇa* iv. 561-2. The text runs thus:—"शास्त्रं चात्र प्रवृत्तं सत्प्रवृत्तिं कुरुते द्विधा । विधानेन निषेधेन लोकदृष्टिसमाश्रयात् ॥ ५६१ ॥ शृङ्गग्राहिकया यद्धि बोधयेत्तद्विधायकम् । यथा लोके करे तेऽस्ति फलमित्यादिभाषणम् ॥ ५६२ ॥" On the latter verse, Râmakṛishṇa says:—"तत्र विधायकशास्त्रस्य लक्षणं लौकिकमुदाहरणं चाह शृङ्गेति । शृङ्गस्य ग्रहणं यस्यां क्रियायां सा शृङ्ग-ग्राहिका । संज्ञायामिति ण्वुल् । (Pâṇ. 3. 3. 108–9) । यथा गोव्रजे का मदीया गौरिति गोपः पृष्टः शृङ्गं गृहीत्वा गां प्रदर्शयेत्तथाबोधकं शास्त्रं विधायकमुच्य-ते" ॥ So too, in Sures'vara's vârtika on *Bṛihadâraṇyakopani-shadbhâshya* 1. 4. 866:—"शृङ्गग्राहिकया श्रुत्या ब्रह्मतापोदिता स्फुटम्", on which Ânandagiri says:—"यथा गोमण्डलस्थां गां शृङ्गं गृहीत्वा विशेषतो दर्शयत्येषा बहुक्षीरेति &c." The same sense is attached to the maxim in Nîlakaṇṭha on *Udyoga-Parva* XLV. 9 ("मदोऽष्टादशदोषः स स्यात्पुरा योऽप्रकीर्तितः") where we read:—"अप्रकीर्तित इति दमविरो-धिन एव प्रातिकूल्यादयो मददोषत्वेन सूचिता अपि शृङ्गग्राहिकया प्रकर्षेण विधिमुखेन न प्रोक्ता इत्यर्थः" ॥ A fourth instance of the employment of this maxim in the same sense is found in the metrical com-ment on *S'âṇḍilya-sûtra* 87:—"न तावत्समवायेन भेदसंबन्धगौरवात् । शब्दानां समयोऽप्येवं शृङ्गग्राहिकया लघुः" ॥ The passage is translated by Prof. Cowell as follows:—"It will not do to hold that the connexion between the cause and its effect may be that

called 'Intimate relation,' and not that called 'Identity,'—because it is a much more cumbrous assumption than ours and involves the connexion of 'difference,' and by our own we easily get at the true meaning of the various S'ruti passages,—seizing them one by one, as oxen by their horns." In a foot-note he adds:—"That is, such passages as 'Uktha is Brahman,' 'Prâṇa is Brahman' &c. *S'ṛingagrâhikânyâya* is a proverb sometimes explained as 'catching an unruly bull first by securing one horn and then the second,' and sometimes, 'driving many oxen into a stall, by seizing them one by one by their horns'." In *Bhâmatî* 3. 2. 22 (page 566) we have the phrase again:—"यथा गवादयो विषयाः साक्षाच्छृङ्गग्राहिकया प्रतिपाद्यन्ते प्रतीयन्ते च नैवं ब्रह्म" ॥ Mr. F. W. Thomas has pointed out to me the शीर्षग्रहणन्याय which is quoted in the commentary on Daṇḍin's *Kâvyâdars'a* ii. 368. I think its usage must be similar to that of the above.

श्येनकपोतीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the hawk and the pigeon*. Vardhamâna, in *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 195, explains it in the following way:—"श्येनकपोतयोरिव श्येनकपोतीयो दुर्योगः । यथा कपोतोऽतर्कितमागतेन श्येनेन गृहीतस्तथाकस्मिको यो दुर्योगः स एवमुच्यते" ॥ This must be classed therefore with शरपुरुषीय and others of a similar kind. We have a श्येनकपोतीयमुपाख्यानं given in the table of contents which forms the opening part of the *Mahâbhârata*, and the story will be found in *Vanaparva* cxcvi. There is another in chapter cxxxi.

श्वश्रूनिर्गच्छोक्तिन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the mother-in-law who said, 'Be off.'* This quaint illustration appears in Sures'vara's *Naishkarmyasiddhi*

i. 28, as follows:—"अभ्युपगताभ्युपगमाच्च श्वश्रूनिर्गच्छोक्तिवद्भवतो निष्
योजनः प्रलापः" ॥ "And since you now express agreement wit
that which we also acknowledge, your protracted discussio
was as unreasonable as was the mother-in-law's saying [to tl
mendicant] 'Be off." The commentator, Jnânottama, e
plains this in the following manner:—"भिक्षामटते माणवकाय भि
प्रत्याचक्षाणामात्मनः स्नुषां भर्त्सयित्वा श्वश्रूः पुनस्तमाहूय समागते तस्मिन्ना
भिक्षा निर्गच्छेति तथैव प्रत्याचष्टे" ॥ "After abusing her daughter-i
law for refusing to give alms to a wandering mendicant, t
mother-in-law called him back, and, when he had come, said
him, There are no alms, be off,' thus refusing also herself!

सिंहावलोकनन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a lion's glance.* This is based on a lio
habit of looking in front and behind, after killing its prey,
see if there is any rival to dispute possession! It is appli
says Târânâtha, where a word in a sentence is connected wi
what precedes and with that which follows it. It is not, ho
ever, restricted to this. The expression occurs four times in t
Taittirîya-Prâtis'âkhya, namely in ii. 51, iv. 4, xiii. 3 and 1
Prof. Whitney remarks as follows on the first instance of
occurrence:—"The 'and' of this rule [वर्गवच्चैषु], the comment
tor says, brings forward, on the principle of 'the lion's look'
distant glance backward), the already defined organs of pr
duction of the various mute series." It is found also in Nî
kaṇṭha's comment on *Vanaparva* ccxxi. 1 (गुरुभिर्नियमैर्जातो भर
नाम पावकः) :—"सिंहावलोकनन्यायेन शंयोः पौत्रमूर्जपुत्रं भरतं स्तौति साधे
गुरुभिरिति" ॥ It was a favourite maxim of Vâcaspatimis'ra's, ar
I have met with it eight times in three of his writings. I
occurs in *Bhâmatî* 2. 3. 6 (page 473); in *Sânkhyatattvakau
mudî,* 7 (page 36); and in *Nyâyavârtika-tâtparyaṭîkâ,* page
97, 199, 230, 322, 403, 405. An example of a different kind i
found in Hemachandra's *Paris'ishṭaparvan,* i. 63:—"सिंहावलो
कनन्यायेनालीढः क्षत्रतेजसा । प्रत्यक्षानिव सोऽद्राक्षीत्तानमात्यान्सुतद्विषः" ॥

सूचीकटाहन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the needle and the boiler.* It is explained as follows in Molesworth's Marâṭhî dictionary:—"A phrase used as an illustration upon the occasion of two matters of which the one is superlatively simple and easy, or altogether insignificant, and the other indefinitely greater, more difficult, or more important, arising at once to be done; and of which it is intended to intimate that the trifling one should be despatched first." It occurs in the opening part of chapter iv of *Kâvyapradîpa*, and again on page 70. Also in the commentary on *Sâhityakaumudî* iv. 1, where the same *kârikâ* is expounded. The following is from the *Saptapadârthî*, page 21. The text runs thus:—"अनुभवोऽपि द्विविधः। प्रमाऽप्रमा च। अप्रमापि संशयो विपर्ययश्च। प्रमा प्रत्यक्षमनुमितिश्च" ॥ On which the commentator remarks:—"प्रमानिरूप्यत्वात्परस्ताद्विभक्तामप्यप्रमां सूचीकटाहन्यायेन प्राग्विभजतेऽप्रमापीति" ॥ There is another good example of the maxim, with a lucid translation by Dr. Ballantyne, in the introduction to Book ii of his *Aphorisms of the Nyâya.*

स्थालीपुलाकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the rice in the cooking-pot.* "In a cooking-pot all the grains being equally moistened by the heated water, when one grain is found to be well cooked the same may be inferred with regard to the other grains. So the maxim is used when the condition of the the whole class is inferred from that of a part." (Apṭe's Sanskrit Dictionary). It is therefore equivalent to "*Ex uno disce omnes.*" Patanjali seems to have laid the foundation of the nyâya in the followinng words, in *Mahâbhâṣya* 1. 4. 23 (vart. 15):—"पर्याप्तो ह्येकः पुलाकः स्थाल्या निदर्शनाय." ॥ Then we find it in Jaimini 7. 4. 12, the sûtra with a portion of S'abara's bhâṣya being as follows:—"लिङ्गस्य पूर्ववत्त्वाच्चोदनाशब्दसामान्यादेकेनापि निरूप्येत यथा स्थालीपुलाकेन ॥ ·····एतन्न्यायपूर्वकं लिङ्गमेकत्रापि दृश्यमानं तुल्यन्यायानां सर्वेषां धर्मवत्तां ज्ञापयति। यथा स्थाल्यां तुल्यपाकानां पुलाकानामेकमुपमृद्यान्येषामपि सिद्धतां जानाति." ॥

Other instances of its occurrence are *Tantravârtika* 3. 5. 19; *Vedântakalpataru*, page 446; *Kalpatarupariṁala*, pages 115, 468, 667, 685; and *Tattvamuktâkalâpa*, 293. Of similar import is the following line from Hemachandra's *Parisiṣṭaparva* vii. 94:—"सिक्थेनापि द्रोणपाकं जानन्ति हि मनीषिणः" ॥

स्थूणानिखननन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the driving in of a post.* As a post is driven into the ground by repeated efforts, so a position is strengthened by the bringing forward of a succession of facts or arguments. It occurs three times in S'ankara's bhâshya on the *Vedântasûtras*; as follows:—"पुनश्च जगज्जन्मादिहेतुत्वमीश्वरस्याक्षिप्यते स्थूणानिखननन्यायेन प्रतिज्ञातस्यार्थस्य दृढीकरणाय" 2. 1. 34. "आक्षेपपूर्विका हि परिहारोक्तिर्विवक्षितेऽर्थे स्थूणानिखननन्यायेन दृढां बुद्धिमुत्पादयति" 3. 3. 53. "सत्यं प्रसाधितं तस्यैव तु स्थूणानिखननवत्फलद्वारेणाक्षेपसमाधाने क्रियेते दार्ढ्याय" 3. 4. 2. But S'abara seems to have originated it in his bhâshya on Jaimini 7. 2. 1.

स्वाङ्गं स्वव्यवधायकं न भवति ॥

One's own body does not hinder one. It is found at the end of the Akshapâda section of the *Sarvadars'anasangraha*, as follows:—"न च स्वातन्त्र्यभङ्गः शङ्कनीयः स्वाङ्गं स्वव्यवधायकं न भवतीति न्यायेन प्रत्युत तन्निर्वाहात्" "Nor need you object that this would interfere with God's own independence [as He would thus seem to depend on others' actions], since there is the well-known saying, 'One's own body does not hinder one;' nay rather it helps to carry out one's aims." This is Professor Cowell's translation.

Other instances of its employment are *Bhâmatî* 3. 4. 20 (page 682); *Tâtparyaṭîkâ*, pp. 72. 90; *Târkikarakṣâṭîkâ*, page 50; *Nyâyamakarandaṭîkâ*, pp. 201, 215; and *Khaṇḍanoddhâra*, pages 58, 62.

CATALOGUE OF SANSKRIT WORKS

DRAMA.

	Price Rs.	as.	Postage.	
Abhijñâna-S'âkuntala by Kâlidâsa, with the commentary (Artha-dyotanikâ) by Râghava-bhaṭṭa	1	8	0	3
Adbhuta-darpaṇa by Mahâdeva...	0	12	0	2
Amṛitodaya by Gokulanâtha	0	8	0	2
Chaitanya-chandrodaya by Karṇapûra ...	1	4	0	4
Dhanañjaya-vijaya by Kâñchanâchârya. ...	0	3	0	1
Dûtâṅgada by Subhaṭa	0	3	0	1
Kaṁsa-vadha by S'esha-kṛishṇa...	0	8	0	2
Karṇa-sundarî by Bilhaṇa	0	8	0	3
Laṭaka-melakaprahasana by S'aṅkhadhara ...	0	5	0	1
Mahâ-vîra-charita by Bhavabhûti, with the commentary (Bhâva-pradyotinî) by Vîra-râghava.	1	8	0	4
Mâlatî-mâdhava by Bhavabhûti, with the commentaries (Bhâva-pradîpikâ) by Tripurâri (1–7 Acts), (Vibudha-ratnâ-vali) by Nânyaḍeva (8–10 Acts) and (Ṭippaṇa) by Jagaddhara	2	4	0	5
Mṛichchhakaṭika by S'ûdraka, with the commentary (Mrichchhakatikâ-vivṛiti) by Pṛithvîdhara	1	4	0	4
Pârvatî-pariṇaya by Bâṇa-bhaṭṭa	0	5	0	1
Prasanna-Râghava by Jayadeva	0	12	0	2
Ratnâvalî by S'rîharsha-deva, with a lucid and elaborate commentary (Prabhâ) by Nârâyaṇa (Dattâtreya) S'âstrî Nigudkar; and an Introduction in English by K. M. Joglekar M. A., discussing the date of the author, etc.	1	4	0	4

	Price Rs.	as.	Postage.
Rukmiṇî-pariṇaya by Râmavarma Vañchi. ...	0	5	0 1
Satya-Harischandra by Râmachandra. ...	0	8	0 2
Uttara-Râma-charita by Bhavabhûti, with the commentary (Tala-spars'inî) by Vîra râghava	1	0	0 3
Vidyâ-pariṇaya by Ânanda-râya Makhî ...	0	9	0 2
Vṛishabhânujâ by Mathurâdas	0	6	0 2
Vikramorvas'îya by Kâlidâsa, with the commentary by Ranganâtha.	0	14	0 4

CHAMPUS.

Champû-bhârata by Ananta Kavi, with the commentary (Lâsya) by Râmachandra Budhendra.	2	12	0 8
Pârijâta-haraṇa by S'eshakṛishṇa.	0	6	0 2
S'rînivâsa-vilâsa by Venkaṭes'a, with the commentary by Dharaṇîdhara.	0	14	0 3
Vis'vaguṇâdars'a by Venkaṭâdhvari, with the commentary (Padârtha-chandrikâ) by Bâlakṛishṇas'arman	1	8	0 6
Yas'astilaka by Somadevasûri, with the commentary (Chandrikâ) by S'rutasâgara —Part I	3	12	0 8
Do. Do. —Part II	2	12	0 8
Yâtrâ Prabandha by Samarapungava Dîkshita...	1	0	0 4

PANDURANG JAWAJI,

Proprietor, Nirnaya-sagar Press,

Kalbadevi Road, BOMBAY.